

THE DATA COMPLEXITY OF DESCRIPTION LOGIC ONTOLOGIES

CARSTEN LUTZ AND FRANK WOLTER

University of Bremen, Germany
e-mail address: clu@uni-bremen.de

University of Liverpool
e-mail address: wolter@liverpool.ac.uk

ABSTRACT. We analyze the data complexity of ontology-mediated querying where the ontologies are formulated in a description logic (DL) of the $\mathcal{ALC}$ family and queries are conjunctive queries, positive existential queries, or acyclic conjunctive queries. Our approach is non-uniform in the sense that we aim to understand the complexity of each single ontology instead of for all ontologies formulated in a certain language. While doing so, we quantify over the queries and are interested, for example, in the question whether all queries can be evaluated in polynomial time w.r.t. a given ontology. Our results include a PTIME/CONP-dichotomy for ontologies of depth one in the description logic $\mathcal{ALCF}$, the equivalence of a PTIME/CONP-dichotomy for $\mathcal{ALC}$ - and $\mathcal{ALCT}$ -ontologies of unrestricted depth to the famous dichotomy conjecture for CSPs by Feder and Vardi, and the failure of PTIME/CONP-dichotomy theorem for $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -ontologies. Regarding the latter DL, we also show that it is undecidable whether a given ontology admits PTIME query evaluation.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the use of ontologies to access instance data has become increasingly popular [PLC⁺08, KZ14, BO15]. The general idea is that an ontology provides domain knowledge and an enriched vocabulary for querying, thus serving as an interface between the query and the data, and enabling the derivation of additional facts. In this emerging area, called ontology-mediated querying, it is a central research goal to identify ontology languages for which query evaluation scales to large amounts of instance data. Since the size of the data typically dominates the size of the ontology and the size of the query by orders of magnitude, the central measure for such scalability is *data complexity*—the complexity of query evaluation where only the data is considered to be an input, but both the query and the ontology are fixed.

In description logic (DL), ontologies take the form of a TBox, data is stored in an ABox, and the most important classes of queries are conjunctive queries (CQs) and variations thereof, such as positive existential queries (PEQs). A fundamental observation regarding this setup is that, for expressive DLs such as $\mathcal{ALC}$ and $\mathcal{SHIQ}$, the complexity of query evaluation is CONP-complete and thus intractable [Sch93, HMS07, GLHS08].¹ The classical approach to avoid this problem is to replace $\mathcal{ALC}$ and $\mathcal{SHIQ}$ with less expressive DLs that are ‘Horn’ in the sense that they can

1998 ACM Subject Classification: Logic, Description Logics.

Key words and phrases: Description Logic, Ontology-Based Data Access, Data Complexity, Conjunctive Queries.

¹When speaking of complexity, we *always* mean data complexity

be embedded into the Horn fragment of first-order (FO) logic. Horn DLs typically admit query evaluation in PTIME, examples include a variety of logics from the $\mathcal{EL}$ [BBL05] and DL-Lite families [CDGL⁺07] as well as Horn- $\mathcal{SHIQ}$, a large fragment of $\mathcal{SHIQ}$ with PTIME query evaluation [HMS07].

It may thus seem that the data complexity of query evaluation in the presence of DL ontologies is understood rather well. However, all results discussed above are on the *level of logics*, i.e., traditional results about data complexity concern a class of TBoxes that is defined in a syntactic way in terms of expressibility in a certain DL language, but no attempt is made to identify more structure *inside* these classes. Such a more fine-grained study, however, seems very natural both from a theoretical and from a practical perspective; in particular, it is well-known that ontologies which emerge in practice tend to use ‘expensive’ language constructs that can result in CONP-hardness of data complexity, but they typically do so in an extremely restricted and intuitively ‘harmless’ way. This distinction between hard and harmless cases cannot be analyzed on the level of logics. The aim of this paper is to initiate a more fine-grained study of data complexity that is *non-uniform* in the sense that it does not treat all TBoxes formulated in the same DL in a uniform way.

When taking a non-uniform perspective, there is an important choice regarding the level of granularity. First, one can analyze the complexity on the *level of TBoxes*, quantifying over the actual query. Then, query evaluation for a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME if every query (from the class under consideration) can be evaluated in PTIME w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ and it is CONP-hard if there is at least one query that is CONP-hard to evaluate w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. And second, one might take an even more fine-grained approach where the query is not quantified away and the aim is to classify the complexity *on the level of ontology-mediated queries (OMQs)*, that is, combinations of a TBox and an actual query. From a practical perspective, both setups make sense; when the actual queries are fixed at the design time of the application, one would probably prefer to work on the level of OMQs whereas the level of TBoxes seems more appropriate when the queries can be freely formulated at application running time. A non-uniform analysis on the level of OMQs has been carried out in [BtCLW14]. In this paper, we concentrate on the level of TBoxes. The ultimate goal of our approach is as follows:

For a fixed DL $\mathcal{L}$ and query language $\mathcal{Q}$, classify all TBoxes $\mathcal{T}$ in $\mathcal{L}$ according to the complexity of evaluating queries from $\mathcal{Q}$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$.

We consider the basic expressive DL $\mathcal{ALC}$, its extensions $\mathcal{ALCI}$ with inverse roles and $\mathcal{ALCF}$ with functional roles, and their union $\mathcal{ALCFI}$. As query languages, we cover CQs, acyclic CQs, and PEQs (which have the same expressive power as unions of conjunctive queries, UCQs, which are thus implicitly also covered). It turns out that, even for $\mathcal{ALC}$, fully achieving the above goal is far beyond the scope of a single research paper. In fact, we show that for any of the mentioned query languages, a full classification of the complexity of $\mathcal{ALC}$ - and $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBoxes is essentially equivalent to a full classification of the complexity of non-uniform constraint satisfaction problems with finite templates (CSPs). The latter is a major research programme ongoing for many years that combines complexity theory, graph theory, logic, and algebra [BJK05, KS09, Bul11, Bar14].

In the current paper, we mainly concentrate on understanding the boundary between PTIME and CONP-hardness of query evaluation w.r.t. DL TBoxes, mostly neglecting other relevant classes such as AC^0 , LOGSPACE, and NLOGSPACE. Our main results are as follows (they always apply to all query languages mentioned above).

1. There is a PTIME/CONP-dichotomy for query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes of depth one, i.e., TBoxes in which existential and universal restrictions are not nested; moreover, PTIME query

evaluation coincides with rewritability into monadic Datalog (with inequalities, to capture functional roles).

The proof rests on interesting model-theoretic characterizations of polynomial time CQ-evaluation which are discussed below. Note that this is a relevant case since most TBoxes from practical applications have depth one. In particular, all TBoxes formulated in DL-Lite and its extensions proposed in [CDGL⁺07, ACKZ09] have depth one, and the same is true for more than 80 percent of the 429 TBoxes in the BioPortal ontology repository.

2. There is a PTIME/CONP-dichotomy for CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBoxes if and only if Feder and Vardi's dichotomy conjecture for CSPs is true; the same holds for $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBoxes.

The proof establishes a close link between query evaluation in $\mathcal{ALC}$ and CSP. While dichotomy questions are mainly of theoretical interest, linking these two worlds is potentially very relevant also for more applied DL research.

3. There is no PTIME/CONP-dichotomy for query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes (unless PTIME = NP).

This is proved by showing that, for every problem in CONP, there is an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox for which CQ-evaluation has the same complexity (up to polynomial time reductions); it then remains to apply Ladner's Theorem, which guarantees the existence of NP-intermediate problems. Consequently, we cannot expect an exhaustive classification of the complexity of query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes.

To prove these results, we introduce two new notions that are of independent interest and general utility. The first one is *materializability* of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$, which means that evaluating a query over an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ can be reduced to query evaluation in a single model of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ (a *materialization*). Note that such models play a crucial role in the context of Horn DLs, where they are often called canonical models or universal models. In contrast to the Horn DL case, however, we only require the *existence* of such a model without making any assumptions about its form or construction.

4. If an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is not materializable, then CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard.

We also investigate the nature of materializations. It turns out that if a TBox is materializable for one of the considered query languages, then it is materializable also for all others. The concrete materializations, however, need not agree. To obtain these results, we characterize CQ-materializations in terms of homomorphisms and ELIQ-materializations in terms of simulations (an ELIQ is an $\mathcal{ELI}$ -instance query, thus the DL version of an acyclic CQ, with a single answer variable).

Perhaps in contrary to the intuitions that arise from the experience with Horn DLs, materializability of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is *not* a sufficient condition for query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ to be in PTIME (unless PTIME = NP) since the existing materialization might be hard to compute. This leads us to study the notion of *unraveling tolerance* of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$, meaning that answers to acyclic CQs over an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ are preserved under unraveling the ABox $\mathcal{A}$. In CSP, unraveling tolerance corresponds to the existence of tree obstructions, a notion that characterizes the well-known arc consistency condition and rewritability into monadic Datalog [FV93, Kro10a]. It can be shown that every TBox formulated in Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ (the intersection of $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ and Horn- $\mathcal{SHIQ}$) is unraveling tolerant and that there are unraveling tolerant TBoxes which are not equivalent to any Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox. Thus, the following result yields a rather general (and uniform!) PTIME upper bound for CQ-evaluation.

5. If an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is unraveling tolerant, then query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME.

Although the above result is rather general, unraveling tolerance of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is *not* a necessary condition for CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ to be in PTIME (unless PTIME = NP). However, for *ALCFL*-TBoxes $\mathcal{T}$ of *depth one*, being materializable and being unraveling tolerant turns out to be equivalent. For such TBoxes, we thus obtain that CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME iff $\mathcal{T}$ is materializable iff $\mathcal{T}$ is unraveling tolerant while, otherwise, CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard. This establishes the first main result above.

Our framework also allows to formally capture some intuitions and beliefs commonly held in the context of CQ-answering in DLs. For example, we show that for every *ALCFL*-TBox $\mathcal{T}$, CQ-evaluation is in PTIME iff PEQ-evaluation is in PTIME iff ELIQ-evaluation is in PTIME, and the same is true for rewritability into monadic Datalog and for CONP-hardness. In fact, the use of multiple query languages and in particular of *ELI*-instance queries does not only yield additional results, but is at the heart of our proof strategies. Another interesting observation in this spirit is that an *ALCFL*-TBox is materializable iff it is convex, a condition that is also called the disjunction property and plays a central role in attaining PTIME complexity for standard reasoning in Horn DLs such as *EL*, DL-Lite, and Horn-*SHIQ*; see for example [BBL05, KL07] for more details.

This paper is an extended and revised version of the conference publication [LW12].

Related Work. An early reference on data complexity in DLs is [Sch93], showing CONP-hardness of ELQs in the fragment *ALC* of *ALC* (an ELQ is an ELIQ in which all edges are directed away from the answer variable). A CONP upper bound for ELIQs in the much more expressive DL *SHIQ* was obtained in [HMS07] and generalized to CQs in [GLHS08]. Horn-*SHIQ* was first defined in [HMS07], where also a PTIME upper bound for ELIQs is established; the generalization to CQs can be found in [EGOS08]. See also [KL07, Ros07, OCE08, CDL⁺13] and references therein for the data complexity in DLs and [BGO10, BMRT11] for related work on the guarded fragment and on existential rules.

To the best of our knowledge, the conference version of this paper was first to initiate the study of data complexity in ontology-mediated querying at the level of individual TBoxes and the first to observe a link between this area and CSP. There is, however, a certain technical similarity to the link between view-based query processing for regular path queries (RPQs) and CSP found in [CGLV00, CGLV03b, CGLV03a]. In this case, the recognition problem for perfect rewritings for RPQs can be polynomially reduced to non-uniform CSP and vice versa. On the level of OMQs, the data complexity of ontology-mediated querying with DLs has been studied in [BtCLW14]; also here, a connection to CSP plays a central role. In [LSW13, LSW15], the non-uniform data complexity of ontology-mediated query answering is studied in the case where the TBox is formulated in an inexpressive DL of the DL-Lite or *EL* family and where individual predicates in the data can be given a closed-world reading, which also gives rise to CONP-hardness of query evaluation; while [LSW13] is considering the level of TBoxes, [LSW15] treats the level of OMQs, establishing a connection to surjective CSPs.

The work on CSP dichotomies started with Schaefer's PTIME/NP-dichotomy theorem, stating that every CSP defined by a two element template is in PTIME or NP-hard [Sch78]. Schaefer's theorem was followed by dichotomy results for CSPs with (undirected) graph templates [HN90] and several other special cases, leading to the widely known Feder-Vardi conjecture which postulates a PTIME/NP-dichotomy for all CSPs, independently of the size of the template [FV93]. An influential approach to studying the complexity of CSPs is via universal algebra [BJK05], and it has resulted in a confirmation of the Feder Vardi conjecture for ternary CSPs [Bul02]. Interesting results have also

been obtained for other complexity classes such as AC^0 [ABI⁺05, LLT07]. For a recent summary of the state of the art we refer to [Bar14].

2. PRELIMINARIES

We introduce the relevant description logics and query languages, define the fundamental notions studied in this paper, and illustrate them with suitable examples.

We shall be concerned with the DL $\mathcal{ALC}$ and its extensions $\mathcal{ALCI}$, $\mathcal{ALCF}$, and $\mathcal{ALCFI}$. Let N_C , N_R , and N_I denote countably infinite sets of *concept names*, *role names*, and *individual names*, respectively. $\mathcal{ALC}$ concepts are constructed according to the rule

$$C, D := \top \mid \perp \mid A \mid C \sqcap D \mid C \sqcup D \mid \neg C \mid \exists r.C \mid \forall r.C$$

where A ranges over N_C and r ranges over N_R . $\mathcal{ALCI}$ concepts admit, in addition, *inverse roles* from the set $N_R^- = \{r^- \mid r \in N_R\}$, which can be used in place of role names. Thus, $A \sqcap \exists r^-. \forall s.B$ is an example of an $\mathcal{ALCI}$ concept. To avoid heavy notation, we set $r^- := s$ if $r = s^-$ for a role name s ; in particular, we thus have $(r^-)^- = r$.

In DLs, ontologies are formalized as TBoxes. An $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox is a finite set of *concept inclusions* (CIs) $C \sqsubseteq D$, where C, D are $\mathcal{ALC}$ concepts, and $\mathcal{ALCI}$ TBoxes are defined analogously. An $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox (resp. $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox) is an $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox (resp. $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBox) that additionally admits functionality assertions $\text{func}(r)$, where $r \in N_R$ (resp. $r \in N_R \cup N_R^-$), declaring that r is interpreted as a partial function. Note that there is no such thing as an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ concept or an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ concept, as the extension with functional roles does not change the concept language.

An ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is a non-empty finite set of assertions of the form $A(a)$ and $r(a, b)$ with $A \in N_C$, $r \in N_R$, and $a, b \in N_I$. In some cases, we drop the finiteness condition on ABoxes and then explicitly speak about *infinite* ABoxes. We use $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ to denote the set of individual names used in the ABox $\mathcal{A}$ and sometimes write $r^-(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$ instead of $r(b, a) \in \mathcal{A}$.

The semantics of DLs is given by *interpretations* $\mathcal{I} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{I}})$, where $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a non-empty set and $\cdot^{\mathcal{I}}$ maps each concept name $A \in N_C$ to a subset $A^{\mathcal{I}}$ of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and each role name $r \in N_R$ to a binary relation $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ on $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. The extension $(r^-)^{\mathcal{I}}$ of r^- under the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is defined as the converse relation $(r^{\mathcal{I}})^{-1}$ of $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ and the extension $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ of concepts under the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \top^{\mathcal{I}} &= \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \\ \perp^{\mathcal{I}} &= \emptyset \\ (C \sqcap D)^{\mathcal{I}} &= C^{\mathcal{I}} \cap D^{\mathcal{I}} \\ (C \sqcup D)^{\mathcal{I}} &= C^{\mathcal{I}} \cup D^{\mathcal{I}} \\ (\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \exists d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} : (d, d') \in r^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ and } d' \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \\ (\forall r.C)^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \mid \forall d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} : (d, d') \in r^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ implies } d' \in C^{\mathcal{I}}\} \end{aligned}$$

An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ *satisfies* a CI $C \sqsubseteq D$ if $C^{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq D^{\mathcal{I}}$, an assertion $A(a)$ if $a \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$, an assertion $r(a, b)$ if $(a, b) \in r^{\mathcal{I}}$, and a functionality assertion $\text{func}(r)$ if $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ is a partial function. Note that we make the *standard name assumption*, that is, individual names are not interpreted as domain elements (like first-order constants), but as themselves. This assumption is common both in DLs and in database theory. The results in this paper do not depend on it.

An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a *model* of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ if it satisfies all CIs in $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ is a *model* of an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ if it satisfies all assertions in $\mathcal{A}$. We call an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ *consistent w.r.t. a TBox* $\mathcal{T}$ if $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ have a joint model.

We consider several query languages. A *positive existential query* (PEQ) $q(\vec{x})$ is a first-order formula with free variables $\vec{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ constructed from atoms $A(x)$ and $r(x, y)$ using conjunction, disjunction, and existential quantification where $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$, $r \in \mathbf{N}_R$, and x, y are individual variables. The variables in $\vec{x}$ are the *answer variables* of $q(\vec{x})$. A PEQ without answer variables is *Boolean*. An *assignment* π for $q(\vec{x})$ in an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is a mapping from the variables that occur in $q(\vec{x})$ to $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. A tuple $\vec{a} = a_1, \dots, a_n$ in $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{I})$ is an *answer to $q(\vec{x})$ in $\mathcal{I}$* if there exists an assignment π for $q(\vec{x})$ in $\mathcal{I}$ such that $\mathcal{I} \models^\pi q(\vec{x})$ (in the standard first-order sense) and $\pi(x_i) = a_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. In this case, we write $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$. A tuple $\vec{a} \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathcal{A}$ an ABox, is a *certain answer to $q(\vec{x})$ in $\mathcal{A}$ w.r.t. a TBox $\mathcal{T}$* , in symbols $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$, if $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$ for all models $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. Computing certain answers to a query in the sense just defined is that main querying problem that we are interested in. Although this paper focusses on the theoretical aspects of query answering, we give a concrete example that illustrates the usefulness of query answering with DL ontologies.

Example 1. *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T} &= \{\text{Professor} \sqsubseteq \text{Academic}, \text{Professor} \sqsubseteq \exists \text{gives.Course}\} \\ \mathcal{A} &= \{\text{Student}(\text{john}), \text{supervisedBy}(\text{john}, \text{mark}), \text{Professor}(\text{mark})\} \\ q(x, y) &= \exists z \text{Student}(x) \wedge \text{supervisedBy}(x, y) \wedge \text{Academic}(y) \wedge \text{gives}(y, z) \wedge \text{Course}(z) \end{aligned}$$

Thus the query asks to return all pairs that consist of a student x and an academic y such that x is supervised by y and y gives a course. Although this information is not directly present in the ABox, because of the TBox it is easy to see that $(\text{john}, \text{mark})$ is a certain answer.

Apart from PEQs, we also study several fragments thereof. A *conjunctive query* (CQ) is a PEQ without disjunction. We generally assume that a CQ $q(\vec{x})$ takes the form $\exists \vec{y} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$, where $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ is a conjunction of atoms of the form $A(x)$ and $r(x, y)$. It is easy to see that every PEQ $q(\vec{x})$ is equivalent to a disjunction $\bigvee_{i \in I} q_i(\vec{x})$, where each $q_i(\vec{x})$ is a CQ (such a disjunction is often called a *union of conjunctive queries*, or UCQ). To introduce relevant fragments of CQs, we recall two further DLs that we use here for querying purposes. $\mathcal{EL}$ concepts are constructed from $\mathbf{N}_C$ and $\mathbf{N}_R$ according to the syntax rule

$$C, D := \top \mid A \mid C \sqcap D \mid \exists r.C$$

and $\mathcal{ELI}$ concepts additionally admit inverse roles. If C is an $\mathcal{ELI}$ concept and x a variable, then $C(x)$ is called an $\mathcal{ELI}$ query (ELIQ); if C is an $\mathcal{EL}$ concept, then $C(x)$ is called an $\mathcal{EL}$ query (ELQ). Note that every ELIQ can be regarded as an acyclic CQ with one answer variable, and indeed this is an equivalent definition of ELIQs; in the case of ELQs, it is additionally the case that all edges are directed away from the answer variable. For example, the ELIQ $\exists r.(A \sqcap \exists s^-.B)(x)$ is equivalent to the acyclic CQ

$$\exists y_1 \exists y_2 (r(x, y_1) \wedge A(y_1) \wedge s(y_2, y_1) \wedge B(y_2)).$$

In what follows, we will not distinguish between an ELIQ and its translation into an acyclic CQ with one answer variable and freely apply notions introduced for PEQs also to ELIQs and ELQs. We also sometimes slightly abuse notation and use PEQ to denote the set of all positive existential queries, and likewise for CQ, ELIQ, and ELQ.

Example 2.

- (1) Let $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, r} = \{A \sqsubseteq \exists r.A\}$ and $q(x) = \exists r.A(x)$. Then we have for any ABox $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, r}, \mathcal{A} \models q(a)$ iff $A(a) \in \mathcal{A}$ or there are $r(a, b), A(b) \in \mathcal{A}$.
- (2) Let $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, l} = \{\exists r.A \sqsubseteq A\}$ and $q(x) = A(x)$. For any ABox $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, l}, \mathcal{A} \models q(a)$ iff there is an r -path in $\mathcal{A}$ from a to some b with $A(b) \in \mathcal{A}$; that is, there are $r(a_0, a_1), \dots, r(a_{n-1}, a_n) \in \mathcal{A}$, $n \geq 0$, with $a_0 = a$, $a_n = b$, and $A(b) \in \mathcal{A}$.

(3) Consider an undirected graph G represented as an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ with assertions $r(a, b), r(b, a) \in \mathcal{A}$ iff there is an edge between a and b . Let $A_1, \dots, A_k, M$ be concept names. Then G is k -colorable iff $\mathcal{T}_k, \mathcal{A} \models \exists x M(x)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_k = & \{A_i \sqcap A_j \sqsubseteq M \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq k\} \cup \\ & \{A_i \sqcap \exists r.A_i \sqsubseteq M \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} \cup \\ & \{\top \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} A_i\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now introduce the main complexity notions investigated in this paper. An *ontology-mediated query (OMQ)* is a pair $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ with $\mathcal{T}$ a TBox and $q(\vec{x})$ a query. The *query evaluation problem* for $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ is to decide, given an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ and $\vec{a}$ in $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, whether $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$. Instead of actually computing certain answers, we concentrate on the query evaluation problem, which is the decision problem version of query answering. In this paper, we are typically interested in joint complexity bounds for *all* OMQs based on a given TBox and query language.

Definition 3. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox and let $\mathcal{Q} \in \{\text{CQ}, \text{PEQ}, \text{ELIQ}, \text{ELQ}\}$. Then

- $\mathcal{Q}$ -evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME if for every $q(\vec{x}) \in \mathcal{Q}$, the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ is in PTIME.
- $\mathcal{Q}$ -evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard if there exists $q(\vec{x}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ is coNP-hard.

Example 4.

(1) PEQ-evaluation w.r.t. the TBoxes $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, r}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, l}$ from Example 2 is in PTIME. This follows from the fact that these TBoxes are $\mathcal{EL}$ TBoxes (TBoxes using only $\mathcal{EL}$ concepts) and it is well known that PEQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{EL}$ -TBoxes is in PTIME [KL07].

(2) Consider the TBoxes $\mathcal{T}_k$ from Example 2 that express k -colorability. For $k \geq 3$, CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_k$ is CONP-hard since k -colorability is NP-hard. However, in contrast to the tractability of 2-colorability, CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_2$ is still CONP-hard. This follows from Theorem 18 below and, intuitively, is the case because $\mathcal{T}_2$ ‘entails a disjunction’: for $\mathcal{A} = \{B(a)\}$, we have $\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{A} \models A_1(a) \vee A_2(a)$, but neither $\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{A} \models A_1(a)$ nor $\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{A} \models A_2(a)$.

In addition to the classification of TBoxes according to whether query evaluation is in PTIME or CONP-hard, we are also interested in whether OMQs based on the TBox are rewritable into more classical database querying languages, in particular into Datalog.

A *Datalog rule* ρ has the form $S(\vec{x}) \leftarrow R_1(\vec{y}_1) \wedge \dots \wedge R_n(\vec{y}_n)$ where $n > 0$, S is a relation symbol, and $R_1, \dots, R_n$ are relation symbols, that is, concept names and role names. We refer to $S(\vec{x})$ as the *head* of ρ and $R_1(\vec{y}_1) \wedge \dots \wedge R_n(\vec{y}_n)$ as its *body*. Every variable in the head of ρ is required to occur also in its body. A *Datalog program* Π is a finite set of Datalog rules with a selected *goal relation* goal that does not occur in rule bodies. Relation symbols that occur in the head of at least one rule are called *intensional relation symbols (IDBs)*, the remaining symbols are called *extensional relation symbols (EDBs)*. Note that, by definition, goal is an IDB. The *arity* of the program is the arity of the goal relation. Programs of arity zero are called *Boolean*.

For an ABox $\mathcal{A}$, a Datalog program Π , and $\vec{a}$ from $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ of the same length as the arity of goal, we write $\mathcal{A} \models \Pi(\vec{a})$ if Π returns $\vec{a}$ as an answer on $\mathcal{A}$, defined in the usual way [CGT89]. A Datalog program Π is a *Datalog-rewriting* of an OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ if for all ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$ and $\vec{a}$ from $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{A} \models \Pi(\vec{a})$. In this case the OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ is called *Datalog-rewritable*. When working with DLs such as $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ that include functional roles, it is more natural to admit the use of inequalities in the bodies of Datalog rules instead of working with ‘pure’ programs. We refer to such extended programs as *Datalog[≠]* programs and accordingly speak of *Datalog[≠]-rewritability*.

Example 5.

(1) The OMQ $(\mathcal{T}_{\exists,l}, A(x))$ from Example 2 expressing a form of reachability is rewritable into the Datalog program

$$\text{goal}(x) \leftarrow P(x), \quad P(x) \leftarrow A(x), \quad P(x) \leftarrow r(x, y) \wedge P(y).$$

(2) The OMQ $(\mathcal{T}_k, \exists x M(x))$ from Example 2 is Datalog-rewritable iff $k \leq 2$ since non-2-colorability can be expressed by a Datalog program but for $k \geq 3$, non- k -colorability cannot be expressed by a Datalog program (in fact, not even by a Datalog[≠] program) [ACY91].

(3) The OMQ $(\{\text{func}(r)\}, \exists x M(x))$ is rewritable into the Datalog[≠] program

$$\text{goal}() \leftarrow r(x, y_1) \wedge r(x, y_2) \wedge y_1 \neq y_2$$

but is not rewritable into pure Datalog.

Definition 6. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox and let $\mathcal{Q} \in \{\text{CQ}, \text{PEQ}, \text{ELIQ}, \text{ELQ}\}$. Then $\mathcal{T}$ is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for $\mathcal{Q}$ if $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for every $q(\vec{x}) \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Example 7. It is folklore that every $\mathcal{EL}$ -TBox is Datalog-rewritable for ELQ, ELIQ, CQ, and for PEQ. Thus, this applies in particular to the TBoxes $\mathcal{T}_{\exists,l}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\exists,r}$ from Example 2. A concrete construction of Datalog-rewritings for ELIQs can be found in the proof of Theorem 24 below. In contrast, the TBox $\mathcal{T}_k$ from Example 2 is not Datalog[≠]-rewritable for ELQ when $k \geq 3$ since the OMQ $(\mathcal{T}_k, \exists x M(x))$ is not Datalog[≠]-rewritable, by Example 5 (2).

It is well-known that Datalog[≠]-programs can be evaluated in PTIME [CGT89], and thus Datalog[≠]-rewritability for $\mathcal{Q}$ of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ implies that $\mathcal{Q}$ -evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME. We shall see later that the converse direction does not hold.

We will often be concerned with homomorphisms between ABoxes and between interpretations, defined next. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be ABoxes. A function $h : \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})$ is a *homomorphism from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) $A(a) \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $A(h(a)) \in \mathcal{B}$ and
- (2) $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $r(h(a), h(b)) \in \mathcal{B}$.

We say that h *preserves* $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}_I$ if $h(a) = a$ for all $a \in I$. Homomorphisms from an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ to an interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ are defined analogously as functions $h : \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \rightarrow \Delta^{\mathcal{J}}$. Note that these two notions are in fact identical since, up to presentation, ABoxes and finite interpretations are the same thing. In what follows we will not always distinguish between the two presentations.

3. MATERIALIZABILITY

We introduce materializability as a central notion for analyzing the complexity and rewritability of TBoxes. A materialization of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ and ABox $\mathcal{A}$ for a class of queries $\mathcal{Q}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ that gives the same answers to queries in $\mathcal{Q}$ as $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ do. It is not difficult to see that a materialization for ELIQs is not necessarily a materialization for CQs and that a materialization for ELQs is not necessarily a materialization for ELIQs. We shall call a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ *materializable for a query language $\mathcal{Q}$* if for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, there is at least one materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ for $\mathcal{Q}$. Interestingly, we show that materializability of $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes does not depend on whether one considers ELIQs, CQs, or PEQs. This result allows us to simply talk about materializable TBoxes, independently of the query language considered. The fundamental

result linking materializability of a TBox to the complexity of query evaluation is that query evaluation is CONP-hard w.r.t. non-materializable $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes. As a first application, we show that PTIME query evaluation and Datalog[≠]-rewritability of $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes also do not depend on the query language, and the same is true for CONP-hardness of query evaluation. As a side line, we also consider the case of $\mathcal{ALCF}$ where, additionally, materializability for ELIQs coincides with materializability for ELQs.

Definition 8. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox and $\mathcal{Q} \in \{\text{CQ}, \text{PEQ}, \text{ELIQ}, \text{ELQ}\}$. Then

- (1) a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ if for all queries $q(\vec{x}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $\vec{a} \subseteq \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, we have $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$;
- (2) $\mathcal{T}$ is $\mathcal{Q}$ -materializable if for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, there exists a $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$.

In Point (1) of Definition 8, it is important that the materialization $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. In fact, for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, we find an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ such that for every CQ $q(\vec{x})$ and $\vec{a} \subseteq \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$; take, for example, the direct product of all (up to isomorphisms) countable models of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. Note that $\mathcal{I}$ is, in general, not a model of $\mathcal{T}$.

Note that a $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization can be viewed as a more abstract version of the *canonical* or *minimal* or *universal* model as often used in the context of ‘Horn DLs’ such as $\mathcal{EL}$ and DL-Lite [LTW09, KLT⁺10, BO15] and more expressive ontology languages based on tuple-generating dependencies (tgds) [CGK13] as well as in data exchange [FKMP05]. In fact, the ELQ-materialization in the next example is exactly the ‘compact canonical model’ from [LTW09].

Example 9.

- (1) Let $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, l} = \{\exists r.A \sqsubseteq A\}$ be as in Example 2 and let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ABox. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the interpretation obtained from $\mathcal{A}$ by adding to $A^{\mathcal{I}}$ all $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ such that there exists an r -path from a to some b with $A(b) \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathcal{I}$ is a PEQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ and so $\mathcal{T}$ is PEQ-materializable.
- (2) Let $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, r} = \{A \sqsubseteq \exists r.A\}$ be as in Example 2 and let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ABox with at least one assertion of the form $A(a)$. To obtain an ELQ-materialization $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, start with $\mathcal{A}$ as an interpretation, add a fresh domain element d_r to $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and to $A^{\mathcal{I}}$, and extend $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ with (a, d_r) and (d_r, d_r) for all $A(a) \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, r}$ is ELQ-materializable.

Trivially, every PEQ-materialization is a CQ-materialization, every CQ-materialization is an ELIQ-materialization and every ELIQ-materialization is an ELQ-materialization. Conversely, it follows directly from the fact that each PEQ is equivalent to a disjunction of CQs that every CQ-materialization is also a PEQ-materialization. In contrast, the following example demonstrates that ELQ-materializations are different from ELIQ-materializations. A similar argument separates ELIQ-materializations from CQ-materializations.

Example 10. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, r}$ be as in Example 9,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \{B_1(a), B_2(b), A(a), A(b)\} \text{ and} \\ q(x) &= (B_1 \sqcap \exists r. \exists r^-. B_2)(x), \end{aligned}$$

Then the ELQ-materialization $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}$ from Example 9 is not a $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization for any $\mathcal{Q}$ from the set of query languages ELIQ, CQ, PEQ. For example, we have $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}} \models q(a)$, but $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models q(a)$. An ELIQ/CQ/PEQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is obtained by unfolding $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}$ (see below): instead of using only one additional individual d_r as a witness for $\exists r.A$, we attach to both a and b an infinite r -path of elements that satisfy A . Note that every CQ/PEQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}_{\exists, r}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ must be infinite.

We will sometimes restrict our attention to materializations $\mathcal{I}$ that are countable and *generated*, i.e., every $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ is reachable from some $a \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$ in the undirected graph

$$G_{\mathcal{I}} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}, \{\{d, d'\} \mid (d, d') \in \bigcup_{r \in \mathbf{N}_R} r^{\mathcal{I}}\}).$$

The following lemma shows that we can make that assumption without loss of generality.

Lemma 11. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox, $\mathcal{A}$ an ABox, and $\mathcal{Q} \in \{CQ, PEQ, ELIQ, ELQ\}$. If $\mathcal{I}$ is a $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, then there exists a subinterpretation $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{I}$ that is a countable and generated $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. To construct $\mathcal{J}$ we apply a standard selective filtration procedure to $\mathcal{I}$. More precisely, we identify a sequence $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}) = S_0 \subseteq S_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and then define $\mathcal{J}$ to be the restriction of $\mathcal{I}$ to $\bigcup_i S_i$. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of all concepts of the form $\exists r.C$ that occur in $\mathcal{T}$ and of all concepts $\exists r.\neg C$ such that $\forall r.C$ occurs in $\mathcal{T}$. Assume S_i has already been defined. Then define S_{i+1} as the union of S_i and, for every $d \in S_i$ and concept $\exists r.C \in \mathcal{C}$ with $d \in (\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{I}}$, an arbitrary $d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $(d, d') \in r^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $d' \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ (unless such a d' exists already in S_i). It is easy to see that $\mathcal{J}$ is a countable and generated $\mathcal{Q}$ -materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. $\square$

3.1. Model-Theoretic Characterizations of Materializability. We characterize materializations using simulations and homomorphisms. This sheds light on the nature of materializations and establishes a close connection between materializations and initial models as studied in model theory, algebraic specification, and logic programming [Mal71, MG85, Mak87].

A *simulation from an interpretation $\mathcal{I}_1$ to an interpretation $\mathcal{I}_2$* is a relation $S \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_1} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ such that

- (1) for all $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$: if $d_1 \in A^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ and $(d_1, d_2) \in S$, then $d_2 \in A^{\mathcal{I}_2}$;
- (2) for all $r \in \mathbf{N}_R$: if $(d_1, d_2) \in S$ and $(d_1, d'_1) \in r^{\mathcal{I}_1}$, then there exists $d'_2 \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ such that $(d'_1, d'_2) \in S$ and $(d_2, d'_2) \in r^{\mathcal{I}_2}$;
- (3) for all $a \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_1} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$: $a \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ and $(a, a) \in S$.

Note that, by Condition (3), domain elements that are individual names need to be respected by simulations while other domain elements need not. In database parlance, the latter are thus treated as *labeled nulls*, that is, while their existence is important, their identity is not.

We call a simulation S an *i-simulation* if Condition (2) is satisfied also for inverse roles. Note that S is a homomorphism preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_1} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$ if S is a function with domain $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_1}$. We remind the reader of the following characterizations of ELQs using simulations, ELIQs using i-simulations, and CQs using homomorphisms (see e.g. [LW10]). An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ has *finite outdegree* if the undirected graph $G_{\mathcal{I}}$ has finite outdegree.

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ be interpretations such that $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$ is finite, $\mathcal{I}$ is countable and generated, and $\mathcal{J}$ has finite outdegree. Then the following conditions are equivalent (where none of the assumed conditions on $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ is required for $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$).*

- (1) For all ELIQs $C(x)$ and $a \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$: if $\mathcal{I} \models C(a)$, then $\mathcal{J} \models C(a)$;
- (2) There is an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$.

The same equivalence holds when ELIQs and i-simulations are replaced by ELQs and simulations, respectively. Moreover, the following conditions are equivalent (where none of the assumed conditions on $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ is required for $(3) \Rightarrow (1)$).

- (3) For all PEQs $q(\vec{x})$ and $\vec{a} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$: if $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$, then $\mathcal{J} \models q(\vec{a})$;

- (4) For all CQs $q(\vec{x})$ and $\vec{a} \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$: if $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$, then $\mathcal{J} \models q(\vec{a})$;
 (5) There is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$.

Proof. We prove the equivalence of (3)-(5). The equivalence of (1) and (2) is similar (both for ELIQs and ELQs) but simpler and left to the reader. The implication (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) is trivial. For the proof of (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5), assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is countable and generated and let $\mathcal{J}$ have finite outdegree. We first assume that only a finite set Σ of concept and role names have a non-empty interpretation in $\mathcal{I}$ and then generalize the result to arbitrary $\mathcal{I}$. Assume that (4) holds. First observe that for every finite subset X of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ there is a homomorphism h_X preserving $X \cap \mathbf{N}_I$ from the subinterpretation $\mathcal{I}_{\upharpoonright X}$ of $\mathcal{I}$ induced by X into $\mathcal{J}$: associate with every $d \in X$ an individual variable x_d and regard $\mathcal{I}_{\upharpoonright X}$ as the CQ $q_X(\vec{x}) = \exists \vec{y} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ defined by setting

$$\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \exists \vec{y} \bigwedge_{d \in X \cap \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}} A(x_d) \wedge \bigwedge_{(d, d') \in (X \times X) \cap r^{\mathcal{I}}} r(x_d, x_{d'}),$$

where $\vec{x}$ comprises the individual variables in $\{x_a \mid a \in X \cap \mathbf{N}_I\}$ and $\vec{y}$ comprises the individual variables x_d with $d \in X \setminus \mathbf{N}_I$ (q_X is a CQ by our assumption that only finitely many concept and role names have non-empty interpretation). For the assignment $\pi(x_d) = d$, we have $\mathcal{I} \models_{\pi} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. Thus $\mathcal{I} \models_{\pi} q_X(\vec{x})$ and so, by (2), $\mathcal{J} \models_{\pi} q_X(\vec{x})$. Consequently, there exists an assignment π' for $q_X(\vec{x})$ in $\mathcal{J}$ which coincides with π on $\{x_a \mid a \in X \cap \mathbf{N}_I\}$ such that $\mathcal{J} \models_{\pi'} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. Let $h_X(d) = \pi'(d)$ for $d \in X$. Then h_X is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}_{\upharpoonright X}$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $X \cap \mathbf{N}_I$, as required.

We now lift the homomorphisms h_X to a homomorphism h from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is countable and generated, there exists a sequence $X_0 \subseteq X_1 \subseteq \dots$ of finite subsets of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $X_0 = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$, $\bigcup_{i \geq 0} X_i = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, and for all $d \in X_i$ there exists a path in X_i from some $a \in X_0$ to d .

By the observation above, we find homomorphisms h_{X_i} from $\mathcal{I}_{\upharpoonright X_i}$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $X_i \cap \mathbf{N}_I$, for $i \geq 0$. Let $d_0, d_1 \dots$ be an enumeration of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. We define the required homomorphism h as the limit of a sequence $h_0 \subseteq h_1 \subseteq \dots$, where each h_n has domain $\{d_0, \dots, d_n\}$ and where we ensure for each h_n and all $d \in \{d_0, \dots, d_n\}$ that there are infinitely many j with $h_n(d) = h_{\upharpoonright X_j}(d)$. Observe that since $\mathcal{J}$ has finite outdegree and since for all $d \in X_i$, there exists a path in X_i from some $a \in X_0$ to d , for each $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ there exist only finitely many distinct values in $\{h_{\upharpoonright X_j}(d) \mid j \geq 0\}$. By the pigeonhole principle, there thus exist infinitely many j with the same value $h_{X_j}(d)$. For $h_0(d_0)$ we take such a value for d_0 . Assume h_n has been defined and assume that the set $I = \{j \mid h_n(d) = h_{\upharpoonright X_j}(d) \text{ for all } d \in \{d_0, \dots, d_n\}\}$ is infinite. Again by the pigeonhole principle, we find a value $e \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}}$ such that $h_{X_j}(d_{n+1}) = e$ for infinitely many $j \in I$. We set $h_{n+1}(d_{n+1}) = e$. The function $h = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} h_i$ is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$, as required.

To lift this result to arbitrary interpretations $\mathcal{I}$, it is sufficient to prove that the homomorphisms h_X still exist. This can be shown using again the pigeonhole principle. Let $X \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ be finite. We may assume that for each $d \in X$, there exists a path in X from some $a \in X \cap \mathbf{N}_I$ to d . We have shown that for each finite set Σ of concept and role names, there exists a homomorphism h_X^{Σ} from the Σ -reduct $\mathcal{I}_X^{\Sigma}$ of $\mathcal{I}_X$ to $\mathcal{J}$ ($\mathcal{I}_X^{\Sigma}$ interprets only the symbols in Σ as non-empty). Since $\mathcal{J}$ has finite outdegree, infinitely many h_X^{Σ} coincide. A straightforward modification of the pigeonhole argument above can now be used to construct the required homomorphism h_X .

For the proof of (5) $\Rightarrow$ (3), assume $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$ and let h be a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \mathbf{N}_I$. Let π be an assignment for $q(\vec{x})$ in $\mathcal{I}$ witnessing $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$. Then the composition $h \circ \pi$ is an assignment for $q(\vec{x})$ in $\mathcal{J}$ witnessing $\mathcal{J} \models q(\vec{a})$. $\square$

For the next steps, we need some observations regarding the unfolding of interpretations into forest-shaped interpretations. Let us first make precise what we mean by unfolding. The *i-unfolding* of an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is an interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ defined as follows. The domain $\Delta^{\mathcal{J}}$ of $\mathcal{J}$ consists of all words $d_0 r_1 \dots r_n d_n$ with $n \geq 0$, each d_i from $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and each r_i a (possibly inverse) role such that

- (a) $d_i \in N_I$ iff $i = 0$;
- (b) $(d_i, d_{i+1}) \in r_{i+1}^{\mathcal{I}}$ for $0 \leq i < n$;
- (c) if $r_i^- = r_{i+1}$, then $d_{i-1} \neq d_{i+1}$ for $0 < i < n$.

For $d_0 \dots d_n \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}}$, we set $\text{tail}(d_0 \dots d_n) = d_n$. Now set

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\mathcal{J}} &= \{w \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}} \mid \text{tail}(w) \in A^{\mathcal{I}}\} && \text{for all } A \in N_C \\ r^{\mathcal{J}} &= (r^{\mathcal{I}} \cap (N_I \times N_I)) \cup \\ &\quad \{(\sigma, \sigma r d) \mid \sigma, \sigma r d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}}\} \cup \{(\sigma r^- d, \sigma) \mid \sigma, \sigma r^- d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}}\} && \text{for all } r \in N_R. \end{aligned}$$

We say that an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is *i-unfolded* if it is isomorphic to its own i-unfolding. Clearly, every i-unfolding of an interpretation is i-unfolded.

For $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes, it is not required to unfold along inverse roles. This is reflected in the *unfolding* of an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$, where in contrast to the i-unfolding we use as the domain the set of all words $d_0 r_1 \dots r_n d_n$ with $n \geq 0$, each d_i from $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, and each r_i a *role name* such that Conditions (a) and (b) above are satisfied. The interpretation of concept and role names remains the same. We call an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ *unfolded* if it is isomorphic to its own unfolding. The following lemma summarizes the main properties of unfoldings. Its proof is straightforward and left to the reader.

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an interpretation, $\mathcal{I}^i$ its i-unfolding, and $\mathcal{I}^u$ its unfolding. Then for every interpretation $\mathcal{J}$, the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) *the function $f(w) := \text{tail}(w)$, $w \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}^i}$, is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}^i$ to $\mathcal{I}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap N_I$;*
- (2) *the function $f(w) := \text{tail}(w)$, $w \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}^u}$, is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}^u$ to $\mathcal{I}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap N_I$;*
- (3) *if there is an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$, then there is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}^i$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap N_I$;*
- (4) *if there is a simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$, then there is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}^u$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap N_I$;*
- (5) *if $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ with $\mathcal{T}$ an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox, then $\mathcal{I}^i$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$;*
- (6) *if $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ with $\mathcal{T}$ an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox, then $\mathcal{I}^u$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$.*

An interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ is called *hom-initial* in a class $\mathbb{K}$ of interpretations if for every $\mathcal{J} \in \mathbb{K}$, there exists a homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$ preserving $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap N_I$. $\mathcal{I}$ is called *sim-initial* (*i-sim-initial*) in a class $\mathbb{K}$ of interpretations if for every $\mathcal{J} \in \mathbb{K}$, there exists a simulation (i-simulation) from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$. The following theorem provides the announced characterization of materializations in terms of simulations and homomorphisms. In the following, the class of all models of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is denoted by $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$.

Theorem 14. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox, $\mathcal{A}$ an ABox, and let $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ be countable and generated. Then $\mathcal{I}$ is*

- (1) *an ELIQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ iff it is i-sim-initial in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$;*
- (2) *a CQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ iff it is a PEQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ iff it is hom-initial in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$;*

(3) an ELQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ iff it is sim-initial in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$, provided that $\mathcal{T}$ is an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox.

The ‘only if’ directions of all three points hold without any of the assumed conditions on $\mathcal{I}$.

Proof. We show that (1) follows from Lemma 12 and Lemma 13; (2) and (3) can be proved similarly.

We start with the direction from right to left. Assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is i-sim-initial in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, we have $\mathcal{I} \models C(a)$ whenever $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C(a)$ for any ELIQ $C(x)$ and $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. Conversely, if $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models C(a)$ then there exists a model $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{J} \not\models C(a)$. There is an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$. Thus, by the implication (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) from Lemma 12, we have $\mathcal{I} \not\models C(a)$ as required.

For the direction from left to right, assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is a materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ and take a model $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. We have to construct an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}$. It actually suffices to construct an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to the i-unfolding $\mathcal{J}^i$ of $\mathcal{J}$: by Point (3) of Lemma 13, there is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{J}^i$ to $\mathcal{J}$ and the composition of an i-simulation with a homomorphism is again an i-simulation.

To obtain an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}^i$, we first identify a subinterpretation $\mathcal{J}'$ of $\mathcal{J}^i$ that has finite outdegree and is still a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. By the implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) from Lemma 12 and since $\mathcal{I}$ is a materialization, there must then be an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}'$. Clearly this is also an i-simulation from $\mathcal{I}$ to $\mathcal{J}^i$ and we are done.

It thus remains to construct $\mathcal{J}'$, which is done by applying selective filtration to $\mathcal{J}^i$ in exactly the same way as in the proof of Lemma 11. It can be verified that the outdegree of the resulting subinterpretation $\mathcal{J}'$ of $\mathcal{J}^i$ is bounded by $|\mathcal{T}| + |\mathcal{A}|$ and, therefore, finite. By construction, $\mathcal{J}' \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$. $\square$

The following example shows that the generatedness condition in Theorem 14 cannot be dropped. We leave it open whether the same is true for countability.

Example 15. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{A \sqsubseteq \exists r.A, B \sqsubseteq A\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{B(a)\}$ and consider the interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{a\} \cup \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{\dots, -2', -1', 0', 1', 2', \dots\} \\ A^{\mathcal{I}} &= \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \\ B^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{a\} \\ r^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{(a, 0)\} \cup \{(n, n+1) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{(n', n'+1) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{I}$ is a PEQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, but it is not hom-initial (and in fact not even sim-initial) since the restriction of $\mathcal{I}$ to domain $\{a\} \cup \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ is also a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, but there is no homomorphism (and no simulation) from $\mathcal{I}$ to this restriction preserving $\{a\}$.

As an application of Theorem 14, we now show that materializability coincides for the query languages PEQ, CQ, and ELIQ (and that for $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes, all these also coincide with ELQ-materializability).

Theorem 16. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $\mathcal{T}$ is PEQ-materializable;
- (2) $\mathcal{T}$ is CQ-materializable;
- (3) $\mathcal{T}$ is ELIQ-materializable;
- (4) $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ contains an i-sim-initial $\mathcal{I}$, for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$;
- (5) $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ contains a hom-initial $\mathcal{I}$, for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$.

If $\mathcal{T}$ is an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox, then the above is the case iff $\mathcal{T}$ is ELQ-materializable iff $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ contains a sim-initial $\mathcal{I}$, for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. The implications (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) and (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) are trivial. For (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4), let $\mathcal{I}$ be an ELIQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and an ABox $\mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 11, we may assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is countable and generated. By Lemma 14, $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ contains an i-sim-initial interpretation. For (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5), assume that $\mathcal{I} \in \text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ is i-sim-initial. By Points (3) and (5) of Lemma 13, the i-unfolding of $\mathcal{I}$ is hom-initial in $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ and (5) follows. (5) $\Rightarrow$ (1) follows from Theorem 14. The implications for $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes are proved similarly. $\square$

Because of Theorem 16, we sometimes speak of *materializability* without reference to a query language and of *materializations* instead of PEQ-materializations.

3.2. Materializability and CONP-hardness. We show that non-materializability implies CONP-hardness of query evaluation. To this end, we first establish that materializability is equivalent to the disjunction property, which is sometimes also called convexity and plays a central role in attaining PTIME complexity for subsumption in DLs [BBL05], and for attaining PTIME data complexity for query answering with DL TBoxes [KL07].

A TBox $\mathcal{T}$ has the *ABox disjunction property for ELIQ* (resp. *ELQ*) if for all ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$, individuals $a_0, \dots, a_k \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, and ELIQs (resp. ELQs) $C_0(x), \dots, C_n(x)$, $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C_0(a_0) \vee \dots \vee C_k(a_k)$ implies $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C_i(a_i)$ for some $i \leq k$.

Theorem 17. An $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ - ($\mathcal{ALCF}$ -) TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is materializable iff it has the ABox disjunction property for ELIQs (ELQs).

Proof. For the nontrivial “if” direction, let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ABox that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ and such that there is no ELIQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. Then $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{A} \cup \Gamma$ is not satisfiable, where

$$\Gamma = \{\neg C(a) \mid \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models C(a), a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}), C(x) \text{ ELIQ}\}.$$

In fact, any satisfying interpretation would be an ELIQ-materialization. By compactness, there is a finite subset Γ' of Γ such that $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{A} \cup \Gamma'$ is not satisfiable, i.e. $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \bigvee_{\neg C(a) \in \Gamma'} C(a)$. Since $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$, we have $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models C(a)$ for all $\neg C(a) \in \Gamma'$. Thus, $\mathcal{T}$ lacks the ABox disjunction property. $\square$

Based on Theorems 16 and 17, we now establish that materializability is a necessary condition for query-evaluation to be it PTIME.

Theorem 18. If an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ ($\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$) is not materializable, then ELIQ-evaluation (ELQ-evaluation) w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard.

Proof. The proof is by reduction of 2+2-SAT, a variant of propositional satisfiability that was first introduced by Schaefer as a tool for establishing lower bounds for the data complexity of query answering in a DL context [Sch93]. A 2+2 clause is of the form $(p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \neg n_1 \vee \neg n_2)$, where each of p_1, p_2, n_1, n_2 is a propositional letter or a truth constant 0, 1. A 2+2 formula is a finite conjunction of 2+2 clauses. Now, 2+2-SAT is the problem of deciding whether a given 2+2 formula is satisfiable. It is shown in [Sch93] that 2+2-SAT is NP-complete.

We first show that if an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is not materializable, then UELIQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard, where a UELIQ is a disjunction $C_0(x) \vee \dots \vee C_k(x)$, with each $C_i(x)$ an ELIQ. We then sketch the modifications necessary to lift the result to ELIQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$.

Since $\mathcal{T}$ is not materializable, by Theorem 16 it does not have the disjunction property. Thus, there is an ABox $\mathcal{A}_\vee$, individual names $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, and ELIQs $C_0(x), \dots, C_k(x)$ such

that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_\vee \models C_0(a_0) \vee \dots \vee C_k(a_k)$, but $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_\vee \not\models C_i(a_i)$ for all $i \leq k$. Assume w.l.o.g. that this sequence is minimal, i.e., $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_\vee \not\models C_0(a_0) \vee \dots \vee C_{i-1}(a_{i-1}) \vee C_{i+1}(a_{i+1}) \vee \dots \vee C_k(a_k)$ for all $i \leq k$. This clearly implies that for all $i \leq k$,

(*) there is a model $\mathcal{I}_i$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}_\vee$ with $\mathcal{I}_i \models C_i(a_i)$ and $\mathcal{I}_i \not\models C_j(a_j)$ for all $j \neq i$.

We will use $\mathcal{A}_\vee$, the individuals $a_1, \dots, a_k$, and the ELIQs $C_0(x), \dots, C_k(x)$ to generate truth values for variables in the input 2+2 formula.

Let $\varphi = c_0 \wedge \dots \wedge c_n$ be a 2+2 formula in propositional letters $z_0, \dots, z_m$, and let $c_i = p_{i,1} \vee p_{i,2} \vee \neg n_{i,1} \vee \neg n_{i,2}$ for all $i \leq n$. Our aim is to define an ABox $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ with a distinguished individual name f and a UELIQ $q(x)$ such that φ is unsatisfiable iff $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_\varphi \models q(f)$. To start, we represent the formula φ in the ABox $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ as follows:

- the individual name f represents the formula φ ;
- the individual names $c_0, \dots, c_n$ represent the clauses of φ ;
- the assertions $c(f, c_0), \dots, c(f, c_n)$, associate f with its clauses, where c is a role name that does not occur in $\mathcal{T}$;
- the individual names $z_0, \dots, z_m$ represent variables, and the individual names 0, 1 represent truth constants;
- the assertions

$$\bigcup_{i \leq n} \{p_1(c_i, p_{i,1}), p_2(c_i, p_{i,2}), n_1(c_i, n_{i,1}), n_2(c_i, n_{i,2})\}$$

associate each clause with the variables/truth constants that occur in it, where p_1, p_2, n_1, n_2 are role names that do not occur in $\mathcal{T}$.

We further extend $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ to enforce a truth value for each of the variables z_i . To this end, add to $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ copies $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m$ of $\mathcal{A}_\vee$ obtained by renaming individual names such that $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_i) \cap \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_j) = \emptyset$ whenever $i \neq j$. As a notational convention, let a_j^i be the name used for the individual name $a_j \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_\vee)$ in $\mathcal{A}_i$ for all $i \leq m$ and $j \leq k$. Intuitively, the copy $\mathcal{A}_i$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is used to generate a truth value for the variable z_i . To actually connect each individual name z_i to the associated ABox $\mathcal{A}_i$, we use role names $r_0, \dots, r_k$ that do not occur in $\mathcal{T}$. More specifically, we extend $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ as follows:

- link variables z_i to the ABoxes $\mathcal{A}_i$ by adding assertions $r_j(z_i, a_j^i)$ for all $i \leq m$ and $j \leq k$; thus, truth of z_i means that the concept $\exists r_0.C_0$ is true at z_i and falsity means that one of the concepts $\exists r_j.C_j, j \leq k$, is true at z_i ;
- to ensure that 0 and 1 have the expected truth values, add a copy of $C_0(x)$ viewed as an ABox with root $1'$ and a copy of $C_2(x)$ viewed as an ABox with root $0'$; add $r_0(1, 1')$ and $r_1(0, 0')$.

Consider the query $q_0(x) = C(x)$ with

$$C = \exists c.(\exists p_1.\text{ff} \sqcap \exists p_2.\text{ff} \sqcap \exists n_1.\text{tt} \sqcap \exists n_2.\text{tt})$$

which describes the existence of a clause with only false literals and thus captures falsity of φ , where tt is an abbreviation for $\exists r_0.C_0$ and ff an abbreviation for the $\mathcal{ELU}$ -concept $\exists r_1.C_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \exists r_k.C_k$. It is straightforward to show that φ is unsatisfiable iff $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q_0(f)$. To obtain the desired UELIQ $q(x)$, it remains to take $q_0(x)$ and distribute disjunction to the outside.

We now show how to improve the result from UELIQ-evaluation to ELIQ-evaluation. Our aim is to change the encoding of falsity of a variable z_i from satisfaction of $\exists r_1.C_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup \exists r_k.C_k$ at z_i to satisfaction of $\exists h.(\exists r_1.C_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \exists r_k.C_k)$, at z_i , where h is an additional role that does not

occur in $\mathcal{T}$. We can then replace the concept ff in the query q_0 with $\exists h.(\exists r_1.C_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \exists r_k.C_k)$, which gives the desired ELIQ $q(x)$.

It remains to modify $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ to support the new encoding of falsity. The basic idea is that each z_i has k successors $b_1^i, \dots, b_k^i$ reachable via h such that for $1 \leq j \leq k$,

- $\exists r_\ell.C_\ell$ is satisfied at b_j^i for all $\ell = 1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, k$ and
- the assertion $r_j(b_j^i, a_j^i)$ is in $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$.

Thus, $\exists r_1.C_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \exists r_k.C_k$ is satisfied at b_j^i iff C_j is satisfied at a_j^i , for all j with $1 \leq j \leq k$. In detail, the modification of $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ is as follows:

- for $1 \leq j \leq k$, add to $\mathcal{A}_\varphi$ a copy of C_j viewed as an ABox, where the root individual name is d_j ;
- for all $i \leq m$, replace the assertions $r_j(z_i, a_j^i)$, $1 \leq j \leq k$, with the following:
 - $h(z_i, b_1^i), \dots, h(z_i, b_k^i)$ for all $i \leq m$;
 - $r_j(b_j^i, a_j^i), r_1(b_j^i, d_1), \dots, r_{j-1}(b_j^i, d_{j-1}),$
 $r_{j+1}(b_j^i, d_{j+1}), \dots, r_k(b_j^i, d_k)$ for all $i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$.

This finishes the modified construction. Again, it is not hard to prove correctness.

It remains to note that, when $\mathcal{T}$ is an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox, then the above construction of q yields an ELQ instead of an ELIQ. $\square$

The converse of Theorem 18 fails, i.e., there are TBoxes that are materializable, but for which ELIQ-evaluation is CONP-hard. In fact, materializations of such a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ and ABox $\mathcal{A}$ are guaranteed to exist, but cannot always be computed in PTIME (unless PTIME = CONP). Technically, this follows from Theorem 28 later on which states that for every non-uniform CSP, there is a materializable $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox for which Boolean CQ-answering has the same complexity, up to complementation of the complexity class.

3.3. Complexity of TBoxes for Different Query Languages. We make use of our results on materializability to show that PTIME query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes does not depend on whether we consider PEQs, CQs, or ELIQs, and the same is true for Datalog[≠]-rewritability. For $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes, we can add ELQs to the list. Theorem 19 below gives a uniform explanation for the fact that, in the traditional approach to data complexity in OBDA, the complexity of evaluating PEQs, CQs, and ELIQs has turned out to be identical for almost all DLs. It allows us to (sometimes) speak of the ‘complexity of query evaluation’ without reference to a concrete query language.

Theorem 19. *For all $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes $\mathcal{T}$,*

- (1) *PEQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME iff CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME iff ELIQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME;*
- (2) *$\mathcal{T}$ is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for PEQ iff it is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for CQ iff it is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for ELIQ (unless PTIME = CONP);*
- (3) *PEQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard iff CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard iff ELIQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard.*

If $\mathcal{T}$ is an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox, then ELIQ can be replaced by ELQ in (1), (2), and (3). If $\mathcal{T}$ is an $\mathcal{ALCI}$ TBox, then Datalog[≠]-rewritability can be replaced by Datalog-rewritability in (2).

Proof. We start with Points (1) and (2), for which the “only if” directions are trivial. For the converse directions, we may assume by Theorem 18 that the TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is materializable. The implications from CQ to PEQ in Points (1) and (2) follow immediately from this assumption: one can first transform a given PEQ $q(\vec{x})$ into an equivalent disjunction of CQs $\bigvee_{i \in I} q_i(\vec{x})$. CQ-materializability of $\mathcal{T}$ implies that, for any ABox $\mathcal{A}$ and $\vec{a}$ in $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff there exists $i \in I$ such that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q_i(\vec{a})$. Thus if CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME, evaluation of $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ is in PTIME. The same holds for Datalog $^\neq$ -rewritability because the class of Datalog $^\neq$ -queries is closed under finite union.

We now consider the implications from ELIQ to CQ (and from ELQ to CQ if $\mathcal{T}$ is a $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox) in Points (1) and (2), first concentrating on the PTIME case. The following claim is the main step of the proof. It states that for any CQ $q(\vec{x})$, we can reduce the evaluation of $q(\vec{x})$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ on an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ to evaluating quantifier-free CQs and ELIQs $C(x)$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ (ELQs if $\mathcal{T}$ is an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox), both on $\mathcal{A}$.

Claim 1. For any materializable TBox $\mathcal{T}$ and CQ $q(\vec{x})$ with $\vec{x} = x_1 \cdots x_n$, one can construct a finite set $\mathcal{Q}$ of pairs $(\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}), \mathcal{C})$, where

- $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ is a (possibly empty) conjunction of atoms of the form $x = y$ or $r(x, y)$, where r is a role name in $q(\vec{x})$ and
- $\mathcal{C}$ is a finite set of ELIQs

such that the following conditions are equivalent for any ABox $\mathcal{A}$ and $\vec{a} = a_1 \cdots a_n$ from $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$:

- (i) $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$;
- (ii) there exists $(\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}), \mathcal{C}) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and an assignment π in $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ with $\pi(x_i) = a_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{A} \models_\pi \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$, and $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C(\pi(x))$ for all $C(x) \in \mathcal{C}$.

If $\mathcal{T}$ is an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox, then one can choose ELQs instead of ELIQs in each $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$.

Before we prove Claim 1, we show how the desired results follow from it. Let a CQ $q(\vec{x})$ be given and let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the set of pairs from Claim 1.

- Assume that ELIQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME. Then $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ can be decided in polynomial time since there are only polynomially many assignments π and for any such π , $\mathcal{A} \models_\pi \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ can be checked in polynomial time (using a naive algorithm) and $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C(\pi(x))$ can be checked in polynomial time for each ELIQ $C(x) \in \mathcal{C}$.
- Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is Datalog $^\neq$ -rewritable for ELIQ. Let $p = (\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}), \mathcal{C}) \in \mathcal{Q}$. For each $C(x) \in \mathcal{C}$, choose a Datalog $^\neq$ -rewriting $\Pi_C(x)$ of $(\mathcal{T}, C(x))$, assume w.l.o.g. that none of the chosen programs share any IDB relations, and that the goal relation of $\Pi_C(x)$ is goal_C . Let Π_p be the Datalog $^\neq$ program that consists of the rules of all the chosen programs, plus the following rule:

$$\text{goal}(\vec{x}) \leftarrow \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \wedge \bigwedge_{C(x) \in \mathcal{C}} \text{goal}_C(x).$$

The desired Datalog $^\neq$ -rewriting of $(\mathcal{T}, q(\vec{x}))$ is obtained by taking the union of all the constructed Datalog $^\neq$ queries, which can again be expressed in Datalog $^\neq$.

The implications from ELQs to CQs for $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes in Points (1) and (2) follow in the same way since, then, each $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{Q}$ consists of ELQs only.

For the proof of Claim 1, we first require a technical observation that allows us to deal with subqueries that are not connected to an answer variable in the CQ $q(\vec{x})$. To illustrate, consider the query $q_0 = \exists x B(x)$. To prove Claim 1 for q_0 , we have to find a set $\mathcal{Q}$ of pairs $(\varphi(\vec{y}), \mathcal{C})$ satisfying Conditions (i) and (ii). Clearly, in this case the components $\varphi(\vec{y})$ will be empty and so we have

to construct a finite set $\mathcal{C}$ of ELIQs such that for any ABox $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists x B(x)$ iff there exists an ELIQ $C(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ and an assignment π in $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C(\pi(x))$. An infinite set $\mathcal{C}$ with this property is given by the set of all ELIQs $\exists \vec{r}.B(x)$, where $\vec{r}$ is a sequence $r_1 \cdots r_n$ of roles r_i in $\mathcal{T}$ and $\exists \vec{r}.B$ stands for $\exists r_1 \cdots \exists r_n.B$ —this follows immediately from the assumption that $\mathcal{T}$ is materializable and that, by Lemma 11, for any ABox $\mathcal{A}$ that is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, there exists a generated CQ-initial model of $\mathcal{T}$ and ABox $\mathcal{A}$. The following result states that it is sufficient to include in $\mathcal{C}$ the set of all $\exists \vec{r}.B(x)$ with $\vec{r}$ of length bounded by $n_0 := 2^{(2(|\mathcal{T}|+|\mathcal{C}|))} \cdot 2|\mathcal{T}| + 1$.

Claim 2. Let C be an $\mathcal{ELI}$ -concept and assume that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists x C(x)$. If $\mathcal{T}$ is materializable, then there exists a sequence of roles $\vec{r} = r_1 \cdots r_n$ with r_i in $\mathcal{T}$ and of length $n \leq n_0$ and an $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists \vec{r}.C(a)$. If C is an $\mathcal{EL}$ -concept and $\mathcal{T}$ an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox, then the sequence $\vec{r}$ consists of role names in $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof of Claim 2. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a CQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. By Points (3) and (5) of Lemma 13, we may assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is i-unfolded. From $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists x C(x)$, we obtain $C^{\mathcal{I}} \neq \emptyset$. Let n be minimal such that there are $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $n = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{I}}(d, a)$ where $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{I}}(d, a)$ denotes the length of the shortest path from d to a in the undirected graph $G_{\mathcal{I}}$. If $n \leq n_0$, we are done. Otherwise fix an $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and denote by M the set all $e \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ with $n = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{I}}(e, a)$. Let $d_0, \dots, d_n$ with $a = d_0$, $d_n = d$, and $(d_i, d_{i+1}) \in r_{i+1}^{\mathcal{I}}$ for $i < n$ be the shortest path from a to d . Observe that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists \vec{r}.C(a)$ for $\vec{r} = r_0 \cdots r_{n-1}$ since $\mathcal{I}$ is a materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. We now employ a pumping argument to show that this leads to a contradiction. Let $\text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C)$ denote the closure under single negation of the set of subconcepts of concepts in $\mathcal{T}$ and C . Set

$$t_{\mathcal{T}, C}^{\mathcal{I}}(e) = \{D \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C) \mid e \in D^{\mathcal{I}}\}.$$

As $n > n_0$, then there exist d_i and d_{i+j} with $j > 1$ and $i + j < n$ such that

$$t_{\mathcal{T}, C}^{\mathcal{I}}(d_i) = t_{\mathcal{T}, C}^{\mathcal{I}}(d_{i+j}), \quad t_{\mathcal{T}, C}^{\mathcal{I}}(d_{i+1}) = t_{\mathcal{T}, C}^{\mathcal{I}}(d_{i+j+1}), \quad r_{i+1} = r_{i+j+1}$$

Now replace in $\mathcal{I}$ the interpretation induced by the subtree rooted at d_{i+j+1} by the interpretation induced by the subtree rooted at d_{i+1} . We do the same construction for all elements of M and denote the resulting interpretation by $\mathcal{J}$. One can easily show by induction that $\mathcal{J}$ is still a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$, but now $\mathcal{J} \not\models \exists \vec{r}.C(a)$ and so $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models \exists \vec{r}.C(a)$. This contradiction finishes the proof of Claim 2. For $\mathcal{EL}$ -concepts and $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes, Claim 2 can be proved similarly by using an unfolded (rather than i-unfolded) materialization, which exists by Points (4) and (6) of Lemma 13.

Proof of Claim 1. Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ and $q(\vec{x}) = \exists \vec{y} \psi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ are given. We have to construct a set $\mathcal{Q}$ such that Conditions (i) and (ii) are satisfied. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ABox with $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$, $\mathcal{I}$ a materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ that is i-unfolded, and π an assignment in $\mathcal{I}$ such that $\mathcal{I} \models_{\pi} \psi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$. We define a corresponding pair $p = (\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{z}), C)$ to be included in $\mathcal{Q}$ (and these are the only pairs in $\mathcal{Q}$).

For identifying $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{z})$, set $x \sim y$ if $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ and denote by $[x]$ the equivalence class of x w.r.t. “ $\sim$ ”. Let φ_0 be the set of all atoms $r([x], [y])$ such that $\pi(x), \pi(y) \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and there are $x' \in [x]$ and $y' \in [y]$ with $r(x', y')$ in ψ . We obtain $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ by selecting an answer variable $y \in [x]$ for every $[x]$ that contains such a variable and then replacing $[x]$ by y in φ_0 , adding $x_i = x_j$ to $\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{z})$ for any two (selected) answer variables x_i, x_j with $x_i \sim x_j$, and by regarding the remaining equivalence classes $[y]$ that do not contain answer variables as variables in $\vec{z}$.

We now identify C . Assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathcal{I}$ uses the naming scheme of i-unravelings. Let $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. By $\mathcal{I}_a$, we denote the subinterpretation of $\mathcal{I}$ induced by the set of all elements $ar_1 d_1 \cdots r_n d_n \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. Let M be a maximal connected component of $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_a} \cap \{\pi(y) \mid y \in \text{var}(\psi)\}$. We associate with M an ELIQ to be included in $\mathcal{C}$ (and these are the only ELIQs in $\mathcal{C}$).

The conjunctive query φ_M consists of all atoms $r([x], [y])$ such that $\pi(x), \pi(y) \in M$ and there are $x' \in [x], y' \in [y]$ with $r(x', y')$ in ψ and all atoms $A([x])$ such that $\pi(x) \in M$ and there is $x' \in [x]$ with $A(x')$ in ψ . We again assume that equivalence classes $[x]$ that contain an answer variable (there is at most one such class in φ_M) are replaced with an answer variable from $[x]$ and regard the remaining equivalence classes as variables. Note that φ_M is tree-shaped since $\mathcal{I}_a$ is. We can thus pick a variable x_0 with $\pi(x_0) \in M$ such that $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{I}}(a, \pi(x_0))$ is minimal. Let x be $[x_0]$ if $[x_0]$ contains no answer variable and, otherwise, let x be the answer variable that $[x_0]$ has been replaced with. Let $[y_1], \dots, [y_m]$ be the variables in φ_M that are distinct from x and consider the ELIQ $\exists[y_1] \dots \exists[y_m] \varphi_M(x, [y_1], \dots, [y_m])$, which we write as $C_M(x)$ where C_M is an appropriate $\mathcal{ELI}$ -concept. We now distinguish the following cases:

- $\pi(x) = a$. In this case, we include $C_M(x)$ in $\mathcal{C}$;
- otherwise, we still know that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists x C(x)$. Thus, by Claim 2 there is a sequence of roles $\vec{r} = r_1 \dots r_n$ with r_i in $\mathcal{T}$ and $n \leq n_0$ such that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists \vec{r}. C_M(a)$ for some $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. In this case, we include $\exists \vec{r}. C_M(y)$ in $\mathcal{C}$ for some fresh individual variable y .

This finishes the construction of $\mathcal{C}$ and thus of $\mathcal{Q}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{Q}$ is finite. The stated properties of $\mathcal{Q}$ follow directly from its construction. For $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes and ELQs, Claim 1 can be proved similarly using an unfolded materialization (instead of an i-unfolded one) and the observation that in this case all $C_M([x])$ and $\exists \vec{r}. C_M(y)$ are ELQs ($\vec{r}$ uses role names only by Claim 2).

We now turn our attention to Point (3). Here, the “if” directions are trivial and we prove the “only if” part. It suffices to show that if PEQ-evaluation w.r.t. a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard, then so is ELIQ-evaluation. We start with showing the slightly simpler result that CONP-hardness of CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ implies CONP-hardness of UELIQ-evaluation, and then sketch the modifications required to strengthen the proof to attain the original statement.

Thus assume that evaluating the CQ $q(\vec{x})$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard. We shall exhibit an UELIQ $q'(x)$ such that for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ and all $\vec{a} \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, one can produce in polynomial time an ABox $\mathcal{A}'$ with a distinguished individual a_0 such that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}' \models q'(a_0)$. Instead of constructing $q'(\vec{x})$ right away, we will start with describing the translation of $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{A}'$. Afterwards, it will be clear how to construct $q'(\vec{x})$.

Thus, let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ABox and $\vec{a}$ from $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. The construction of $\mathcal{A}'$ builds on Claim 1 above. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the set of pairs from that claim and reserve a fresh individual name a_0 . To obtain the desired ABox $\mathcal{A}'$, we extend $\mathcal{A}$ for every pair $p = (\varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}), \mathcal{C})$ in $\mathcal{Q}$. Let $\mathcal{C} = C_{p,1}(x_1), \dots, C_{p,k_p}(x_{k_p})$. Then

- introduce a fresh individual name a_p and fresh role names $r_p, r, r_{p,1}, \dots, r_{p,k_p}$;
- add the assertion $r_p(a_0, a_p)$;
- for every assignment π in $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ with $\mathcal{A} \models_{\pi} \varphi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ and $\pi(\vec{x}) = \vec{a}$, introduce
 - a fresh individual name $a_{p,\pi}$ and the assertion $r(a_p, a_{p,\pi})$;
 - the assertion $r_{p,i}(a_p, \pi(x_i))$ for $1 \leq i \leq k_p$.

From Claim 1, it is immediate that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}' \models q'(x)$ where $q'(x)$ is the UELIQ $\bigcup_{p \in \mathcal{Q}} q'(x)$ with $C_p = \exists r_p. \exists r. \bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq k_p} \exists r_{p,i}. C_{p,i}$. Thus, evaluating $q'(x)$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard, as required.

It remains to modify the reduction by replacing CQs with PEQs and UELIQs with ELIQs. The former is straightforward: every PEQ is equivalent to a finite disjunction of CQs, and thus we can construct $\mathcal{A}'$ and $q'(x)$ in essentially the same way as before; instead of considering all pairs from $\mathcal{Q}$ for a single CQ, we now use the union of all sets $\mathcal{Q}$ for the finitely many CQs in question. Finally, we can replace UELIQs with ELIQs by using the same construction as in the proof of Theorem 18: after adding some straightforward auxiliary structure to $\mathcal{A}'$, one can replace a

disjunction of ELIQs by (essentially) their conjunction, which is again an ELIQ. Details are left to the reader. $\square$

We remark that Theorem 19 can be extended to also cover rewritability into first-order (FO) queries, and that the proof is almost identical to that for Datalog[≠]-rewritability.

4. UNRAVELING TOLERANCE

We develop a condition on TBoxes, called unraveling tolerance, that is sufficient for the TBox to be Datalog[≠]-rewritable for PEQ, and thus also sufficient for PEQ-evaluation w.r.t. the TBox being in PTIME. Unraveling tolerance strictly generalizes syntactic ‘Horn conditions’ such as the ones used to define the DL Horn- $\mathcal{SHIQ}$, which was designed as a (syntactically) maximal DL with PTIME query evaluation [HMS07, EGOS08].

Unraveling tolerance is based on an unraveling operation on ABoxes, in the same spirit as the unfolding of an interpretation into a tree interpretation we discussed above. Formally, the *unraveling* $\mathcal{A}^u$ of an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is the following (possibly infinite) ABox:

- $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ is the set of sequences $b_0 r_0 b_1 \cdots r_{n-1} b_n$, $n \geq 0$, with $b_0, \dots, b_n \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and $r_0, \dots, r_{n-1} \in \mathbb{N}_R \cup \mathbb{N}_R^-$ such that for all $i < n$, we have $r_i(b_i, b_{i+1}) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $(b_{i-1}, r_{i-1}) \neq (b_{i+1}, r_i)$ when $i > 0$;
- for each $C(b) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\alpha = b_0 r_0 \cdots r_{n-1} b_n \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $b_n = b$, $C(\alpha) \in \mathcal{A}^u$;
- for each $\alpha = b_0 r_0 \cdots r_{n-1} b_n \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $n > 0$, $r_{n-1}(b_0 r_0 \cdots r_{n-1} b_{n-1}, \alpha) \in \mathcal{A}^u$.

For all $\alpha = b_0 \cdots b_n \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, we write $\text{tail}(\alpha)$ to denote b_n . Note that the condition $(b_{i-1}, r_{i-1}) \neq (b_{i+1}, r_i)$ is needed to ensure that functional roles can still be interpreted in a functional way after unraveling.

Definition 20 (Unraveling Tolerance). A TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is *unraveling tolerant* if for all ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$ and ELIQs q , we have that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q$ implies $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}^u) \models q$.

It is not hard to prove that the converse direction ‘ $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}^u \models q$ implies $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q$ ’ is true for all $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes. Note that it is pointless to define unraveling tolerance for queries that are not necessarily tree shaped, such as CQs.

Example 21.

(1) The $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{A \sqsubseteq \forall r.B\}$ is unraveling tolerant. This can be proved by showing that (i) for any (finite or infinite) ABox $\mathcal{A}$, the interpretation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}^+$ that is obtained from $\mathcal{A}$ by extending $B^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}^+}$ with all $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ that satisfy $\exists r^-.A$ in $\mathcal{A}$ (when viewed as an interpretation) is an ELIQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}$; and (ii) $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \models C(a)$ iff $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}^u}^+ \models C(a)$ for all ELIQs $C(x)$ and $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. The proof of (ii) is based on a straightforward induction on the structure of the $\mathcal{ELI}$ -concept C . As illustrated by the ABox $\mathcal{A} = \{r(a, b), A(a)\}$ and the fact that $\mathcal{A}^u, \mathcal{T} \models B(b)$, the use of inverse roles in the definition of $\mathcal{A}^u$ is crucial here despite the fact that $\mathcal{T}_1$ does not use inverse roles.

(2) A simple example for an $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox that is not unraveling tolerant is

$$\mathcal{T}_2 = \{A \sqcap \exists r.A \sqsubseteq B, \neg A \sqcap \exists r.\neg A \sqsubseteq B\}.$$

For $\mathcal{A} = \{r(a, a)\}$, it is easy to see that we have $\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{A} \models B(a)$ (use a case distinction on the truth value of A at a), but $\mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{A}^u \not\models B(a)$.

Before we show that unraveling tolerance indeed implies PTIME query evaluation, we first demonstrate the generality of this property by relating it to Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$, the $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -fragment of Horn- $\mathcal{SHIQ}$. Different versions of Horn- $\mathcal{SHIQ}$ have been proposed in the literature, giving rise to different versions of Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ [HMS07, KRH07, EGOS08, Kaz09]. As the original definition from [HMS07] based on polarity is rather technical, we prefer to work with the following equivalent and less cumbersome definition. A *Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox* $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite set of concept inclusions $L \sqsubseteq R$ and functionality assertions where L and R are built according to the following syntax rules:

$$\begin{aligned} R, R' &::= \top \mid \perp \mid A \mid \neg A \mid R \sqcap R' \mid L \rightarrow R \mid \exists r.R \mid \forall r.R \\ L, L' &::= \top \mid \perp \mid A \mid L \sqcap L' \mid L \sqcup L' \mid \exists r.L \end{aligned}$$

with r ranging over $N_R \cup N_R^-$ and $L \rightarrow R$ abbreviating $\neg L \sqcup R$. Whenever convenient, we may assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathcal{T}$ contains only a single concept inclusion $\top \sqsubseteq C_{\mathcal{T}}$ where $C_{\mathcal{T}}$ is built according to the topmost rule above.

By applying some simple transformations, it is not hard to show that every Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox according to the original polarity-based definition is equivalent to a Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox of the form introduced here. Although not important in our context, we note that even a polynomial time transformation is possible.

Theorem 22.

Every Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox is unraveling tolerant.

Proof. As a preliminary, we give a characterization of the entailment of ELIQs in the presence of Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes which is in the spirit of the chase procedure as used in database theory [FKMP05, CGK13] and of consequence-driven algorithms as used for reasoning in Horn description logics such as $\mathcal{EL}^{++}$ and Horn- $\mathcal{SHIQ}$ [BBL05, Kaz09, Krö10b].

We use *extended ABoxes*, i.e., finite sets of assertions $C(a)$ and $r(a, b)$ with C a *potentially compound* concept. An $\mathcal{ELIU}_{\perp}$ -*concept* is a concept that is formed according to the second syntax rule in the definition of Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$. For an extended ABox $\mathcal{A}'$ and an assertion $C(a)$, C an $\mathcal{ELIU}_{\perp}$ -concept, we write $\mathcal{A}' \vdash C(a)$ if $C(a)$ has a *syntactic match* in $\mathcal{A}'$, formally:

- $\mathcal{A}' \vdash \top(a)$ is unconditionally true;
- $\mathcal{A}' \vdash \perp(a)$ if $\perp(b) \in \mathcal{A}'$ for some $b \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$;
- $\mathcal{A}' \vdash A(a)$ if $A(a) \in \mathcal{A}'$;
- $\mathcal{A}' \vdash C \sqcap D(a)$ if $\mathcal{A}' \vdash C(a)$ and $\mathcal{A}' \vdash D(a)$;
- $\mathcal{A}' \vdash C \sqcup D(a)$ if $\mathcal{A}' \vdash C(a)$ or $\mathcal{A}' \vdash D(a)$;
- $\mathcal{A}' \vdash \exists r.C(a)$ if there is an $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}'$ such that $\mathcal{A}' \vdash C(b)$.

Now for the announced characterization. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{\top \sqsubseteq C_{\mathcal{T}}\}$ be a Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox and $\mathcal{A}$ a potentially infinite ABox (so that the characterization also applies to unravelings of ABoxes). We produce a sequence of extended ABoxes $\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1, \dots$, starting with $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}$. In what follows, we use additional individual names of the form $ar_1C_1 \dots r_kC_k$ with $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_0)$, $r_1, \dots, r_k$ roles that occur in $\mathcal{T}$, and $C_1, \dots, C_k$ subconcept of concept in $\mathcal{T}$. We assume that N_I contains such names as needed and use the symbols $a, b, \dots$ also to refer to individual names of this compound form. Each extended ABox $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{A}_i$ by applying the following rules in a fair way:

- R1 if $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_i)$, then add $C_{\mathcal{T}}(a)$.
- R2 if $C \sqcap D(a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, then add $C(a)$ and $D(a)$;
- R3 if $C \rightarrow D(a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and $\mathcal{A}_i \vdash C(a)$, then add $D(a)$;
- R4 if $\exists r.C(a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and $\text{func}(r) \notin \mathcal{T}$, then add $r(a, arC)$ and $C(arC)$;
- R5 if $\exists r.C(a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, $\text{func}(r) \in \mathcal{T}$, and $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, then add $C(b)$;

R6 if $\exists r.C(a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, $\text{func}(r) \in \mathcal{T}$, and there is no $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, then add $r(a, arC)$ and $C(arC)$;

R7 if $\forall r.C(a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_i$, then add $C(b)$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_c = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{A}_i$ be the *completion* of the original ABox $\mathcal{A}$.² Note that $\mathcal{A}_c$ may be infinite even if $\mathcal{A}$ is finite, and that none of the above rules is applicable in $\mathcal{A}_c$. We write ' $\mathcal{A}_c \vdash \perp$ ' instead of ' $\mathcal{A}_c \vdash \perp(a)$ for some $a \in \mathbf{N}_C$ '. If $\mathcal{A} \not\vdash \perp$, then $\mathcal{A}_c$ corresponds to an interpretation $\mathcal{I}_c$ in the standard way, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_c} &= \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_c) \\ A^{\mathcal{I}_c} &= \{a \mid A(a) \in \mathcal{A}_c\} && \text{for all } A \in \mathbf{N}_C \\ r^{\mathcal{I}_c} &= \{r(a, b) \mid r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}_c\} && \text{for all } r \in \mathbf{N}_R \end{aligned}$$

where in $\mathcal{I}_c$ we assume that only the individual names in $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ are elements of $\mathbf{N}_I$.

Claim 1. If $\mathcal{A}_c \not\vdash \perp$, then $\mathcal{I}_c$ is a PEQ-materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$.

To prove Claim 1 it suffices to show that there is a homomorphism h preserving $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ into any model $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ and that $\mathcal{I}_c$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. The homomorphism h can be constructed inductively following the construction of $\mathcal{A}_c$. Similarly, following the construction of $\mathcal{A}_c$ it is readily checked that $\mathcal{I}_c$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. Using Claim 1 and the easily proved fact that $\mathcal{A}_c \not\vdash \perp$ iff $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ one can now prove

Claim 2. $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C(a)$ iff $\mathcal{A}_c \vdash C(a)$ or $\mathcal{A}_c \vdash \perp$, for all ELIQs $C(x)$ and $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$.

We now turn to the actual proof of Theorem 22. Consider the application of the above completion construction to both the original ABox $\mathcal{A}$ and its unraveling $\mathcal{A}^u$. Recall that individuals in $\mathcal{A}^u$ are of the form $a_0 r_0 a_1 \cdots r_{n-1} a_n$. Consequently, individuals in $\mathcal{A}_c^u$ take the form $a_0 r_0 a_1 \cdots r_{n-1} a_n s_1 C_1 \cdots s_k C_k$. For $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_c)$ and $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_c^u)$, we write $a \sim \alpha$ if a and α are of the form $a_n s_1 C_1 \cdots s_k C_k$ and $a_0 r_0 a_1 \cdots r_{n-1} a_n s_1 C_1 \cdots s_k C_k$, respectively, with $k \geq 0$. Note that, in particular, $a \sim a$ for all $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. The following claim can be shown by induction on i .

Claim 3. For all $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_i)$ and $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_i^u)$ with $a \sim \alpha$, we have

- (1) $\mathcal{A}_i \vdash C(a)$ iff $\mathcal{A}_i^u \vdash C(\alpha)$ for all $\mathcal{ELI}$ -concepts C ;
- (2) $C(a) \in \mathcal{A}_i$ iff $C(\alpha) \in \mathcal{A}_i^u$ for all subconcepts C of concepts in $\mathcal{T}$.

Now, unraveling tolerance of $\mathcal{T}$ follows from Claims 2 and 3. □

Theorem 22 shows that unraveling tolerance and Horn logic are closely related. Yet, the next example demonstrates that there are unraveling tolerant $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes that are not equivalent to any Horn sentence of FO. Since any Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox is equivalent to such a sentence, it follows that unraveling tolerant $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes strictly generalize Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes. This increased generality will pay off in Section 5 when we establish a dichotomy result for TBoxes of depth one.

Example 23. Take the $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox

$$\mathcal{T} = \{\exists r.(A \sqcap \neg B_1 \sqcap \neg B_2) \sqsubseteq \exists r.(\neg A \sqcap \neg B_1 \sqcap \neg B_2)\}.$$

One can show as in Example 21 (1) that $\mathcal{T}$ is unraveling tolerant; here, the materialization is actually $\mathcal{A}$ itself rather than some extension thereof, i.e., as far as ELIQ (and even PEQ) evaluation is concerned, $\mathcal{T}$ cannot be distinguished from the empty TBox.

²Order of rule application has an impact on the shape of $\mathcal{A}_c$, but is irrelevant for the remainder of the proof.

It is well-known that FO Horn sentences are preserved under direct products of interpretations [CK90]. To show that $\mathcal{T}$ is not equivalent to any such sentence, it thus suffices to show that $\mathcal{T}$ is not preserved under direct products. This is simple: let $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ consist of a single r -edge between elements d and e , and let $e \in (A \sqcap B_1 \sqcap \neg B_2)^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ and $e \in (A \sqcap \neg B_1 \sqcap B_2)^{\mathcal{I}_2}$; then the direct product $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ still has the r -edge between (d, d) and (e, e) and satisfies $(e, e) \in (A \sqcap \neg B_1 \sqcap \neg B_2)^{\mathcal{I}}$, thus is not a model of $\mathcal{T}$.

We next show that unraveling tolerance is indeed a sufficient condition for Datalog[≠]-rewritability (and thus for PTIME query evaluation). In Section 6, we will establish a connection between query evaluation under DL TBoxes and constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs). The Datalog[≠] program constructed in the proof of the following result resembles canonical monadic Datalog programs for CSPs [FV93]. Note that it is not clear how to attain a proof of Theorem 24 via the CSP connection: first, as we will also see in Section 6, functional roles break this connection; and second, canonical Datalog programs are available only for Boolean queries while we construct programs for unary queries.

Theorem 24. *Every unraveling tolerant $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for PEQ.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an unraveling tolerant $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox. By Theorem 19, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{T}$ is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for ELIQ. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ABox and $q = C_0(x)$ an ELIQ. Recall from the proof of Theorem 19 that $\text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C_0)$ denotes the closure under single negation of the set of subconcepts of $\mathcal{T}$ and C_0 . For an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ and $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, we use $t_{\mathcal{T},q}^{\mathcal{I}}(d)$ to denote the set of concepts $C \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C_0)$ such that $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$. A $\mathcal{T}, q$ -type is a subset $t \subseteq \text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C_0)$ such that for some model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$, we have $t = t_{\mathcal{T},q}^{\mathcal{I}}(d)$. We use $\text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q)$ to denote the set of all $\mathcal{T}, q$ -types. For $t, t' \in \text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q)$ and r a role, we write $t \rightsquigarrow_r t'$ if there are a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $d, d' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $t_{\mathcal{T},q}^{\mathcal{I}}(d) = t$, $t_{\mathcal{T},q}^{\mathcal{I}}(d') = t'$, and $(d, d') \in r^{\mathcal{I}}$.

Introduce, for every set $T \subseteq \text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, C_0)$ a unary IDB relation P_T . Define a Datalog[≠] program Π that consists of the following rules:

- (1) $P_T(x) \leftarrow A(x)$ for all concept names $A \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C_0)$ and $T = \{t \in \text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q) \mid A \in t\}$;
- (2) $P_T(x) \leftarrow P_{T_0}(x) \wedge r(x, y) \wedge P_{T_1}(y)$ for all $T_0, T_1 \subseteq \text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q)$ and all role names r that occur in $\text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C_0)$ and their inverses, where $T = \{t \in T_0 \mid \exists t' \in T_1 : t \rightsquigarrow_r t'\}$;
- (3) $P_{T_0 \cap T_1}(x) \leftarrow P_{T_0}(x) \wedge P_{T_1}(x)$ for all $T_0, T_1 \subseteq \text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q)$;
- (4) $\text{goal}(x) \leftarrow P_T(x)$ for all $T \subseteq \text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q)$ such that $t \in T$ implies $C_0 \in t$;
- (5) $\text{goal}(x) \leftarrow P_\emptyset(y)$;
- (6) $\text{goal}(x) \leftarrow r(y, z_1) \wedge r(y, z_2) \wedge z_1 \neq z_2$ for all $\text{func}(r) \in \mathcal{T}$.

To show that Π is a rewriting of the OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, C_0(x))$, it suffices to establish the following.

Claim. $\mathcal{A} \models \Pi(a_0)$ iff $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C_0(a_0)$ for all ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$ and $a_0 \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$.

The “if” direction is straightforward: by induction on the number of rule applications, one can show that whenever Π derives $P_T(a)$, then every model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ satisfies $t_{\mathcal{T},q}^{\mathcal{I}}(a) \in T$. By definition of the goal rules of Π , $\mathcal{A} \models \Pi(a_0)$ thus implies that every model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ makes $C_0(a_0)$ true or that $\mathcal{A}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models C_0(a_0)$.

For the “only if” direction, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{A} \not\models \Pi(a_0)$ implies $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}^u \not\models C_0(a_0)$ since $\mathcal{T}$ is unraveling tolerant. Because of the rules in Π of the form (3), for every $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ we can find a unique minimal T_a such that $P_{T_a}(a)$ is derived by Π . Observe that, $A(\alpha) \in \mathcal{A}^u$, $\text{tail}(\alpha) = a$, and $t \in T_a$ implies $A \in t$ because of the rules of the form (1) in Π and by construction of $\mathcal{A}^u$.

We first associate with every $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ a concrete $\mathcal{T}, q$ -type $t_\alpha \in T_{\text{tail}(\alpha)}$. To start, we choose $t_a \in T_a$ arbitrarily for all $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. Now assume that t_α has already been chosen and that

$\beta = \alpha r b \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$. Then $r(\text{tail}(\alpha), b) \in \mathcal{A}$. Because of the rules in Π of the form (2) and (5), we can thus choose $t_\beta \in T_b$ such that $t_\alpha \rightsquigarrow_r t_\beta$. In this way, all types t_α will eventually be chosen. We now construct an interpretation $\mathcal{I}$, starting with

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} &= \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u) \\ A^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{\alpha \mid A \in t_\alpha\} \text{ for all concept names } A \\ r^{\mathcal{I}} &= \{(\alpha, \beta) \mid r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u\} \text{ for all role names } r.\end{aligned}$$

Next, consider every $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ and every $\exists r.C \in t_\alpha$ such that $\mathcal{A}^u$ does not contain an assertion $r(\alpha, \beta)$ with $C \in t_\beta$. First assume that $\text{func}(r) \notin \mathcal{T}$. There must be a $\mathcal{T}$, q -type t such that $t_\alpha \rightsquigarrow_r t$ and $C \in t$. Choose a model $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $D = \sqcap t_a \sqcap \exists r. \sqcap t$, a $d \in D^{\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}}$, and an $e \in (\sqcap t)^{\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}}$ with $(d, e) \in r^{\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}}$. W.l.o.g., we can assume that $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}$ is tree-shaped with root d . Let $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}^-$ be obtained from $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}$ by dropping the subtree rooted at e . Now disjointly add $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}^-$ to $\mathcal{I}$, additionally including (a, d) in $r^{\mathcal{I}}$. Now assume that $\text{func}(r) \in \mathcal{T}$. Then, if there exists $r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$, then $C \in t_\beta$ as otherwise we do not have $t_\alpha \rightsquigarrow_r t_\beta$. Thus, assume there is no $r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$. There must be a $\mathcal{T}$, q -type t such that $t_\alpha \rightsquigarrow_r t$ and $C \in t$. We then have $D \in t$ for all $\exists r.D \in t_\alpha$ and so construct only a single $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}^-$ for the role r and disjointly add $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}^-$ to $\mathcal{I}$, additionally including (a, d) in $r^{\mathcal{I}}$. This finishes the construction of $\mathcal{I}$. The following claim can be proved by induction on C , details are omitted.

Claim. For all $C \in \text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C_0)$:

- (a) $\alpha \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ iff $C \in t_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ and
- (b) $d \in C^{\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.D}}$ iff $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.D}$ and all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.D}}$.

By construction of $\mathcal{I}$ and since $A(\alpha) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ implies $A \in t_\alpha$, $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{A}$. Due to the rules in Π that are of the form (4), Point (a) of the claim yields $\mathcal{I} \not\models C_0(a_0)$. Finally, we observe that $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$. The concept inclusions in $\mathcal{T}$ are satisfied by the above claim, since $C \sqsubseteq D \in \mathcal{T}$ means that $C \in t$ implies $D \in t$ for every $\mathcal{T}$, q -type t , and since each $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$. Due to the rules in Π that are of the form (6) and since each $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha, \exists r.C}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$, all functionality assertions in $\mathcal{T}$ are satisfied as well. Summing up, we have shown that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}^u \not\models C_0(a_0)$, as required. $\square$

Together with Theorems 19 and 22, Theorem 24 also reproves the known PTIME upper bound for the data complexity of CQ-evaluation in Horn- $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ [EGOS08].

By Theorems 18 and 24, unraveling tolerance implies materializability unless $\text{PTIME} = \text{NP}$. Based on the disjunction property, this implication can also be proved without the side condition.

Theorem 25. Every unraveling tolerant $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox is materializable.

Proof. We show the contrapositive using a proof strategy that is very similar to the second step in the proof of Theorem 18. Thus, take an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ that is not materializable. By Theorem 16, $\mathcal{T}$ does not have the disjunction property. Thus, there are an ABox $\mathcal{A}_\vee$, ELIQs $C_0(x_0), \dots, C_k(x_k)$, and $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_\vee)$ such that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_\vee \models C_0(a_0) \vee \dots \vee C_k(a_k)$, but $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_\vee \not\models C_i(a_i)$ for all $i \leq k$. Let $\mathcal{A}_i$ be C_i viewed as a tree-shaped ABox with root b_i , for all $i \leq k$. Assume w.l.o.g. that none of the ABoxes $\mathcal{A}_\vee, \mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ share any individual names and reserve a fresh individual name b and role names $r, r_0, \dots, r_k$ that do not occur in $\mathcal{T}$. Construct an ABox

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} &= \mathcal{A}_\vee \cup \mathcal{A}_0 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_k \cup \{r(b, b_0), \dots, r(b, b_k)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{r_0(b_j, b_0), \dots, r_{j-1}(b_j, b_{j-1}), r_{j+1}(b_j, b_{j+1}), \dots, r_k(b_j, b_k)\} \\ &\quad \cup \{r_0(b_0, a_0), \dots, r_k(b_k, a_k)\}\end{aligned}$$

and an ELIQ

$$q = \exists r.(\exists r_0.C_0 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \exists r_k.C_k)(x).$$

By the following claim, $\mathcal{A}$ and q witness that $\mathcal{T}$ is not unraveling tolerant.

Claim. $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(b)$, but $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}^u \not\models q(b)$.

Proof. “ $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q(b)$ ”. Take a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. By construction of $\mathcal{A}$, we have $b_i^{\mathcal{I}} \in (\exists r_j.C_j)^{\mathcal{I}}$ whenever $i \neq j$. Due to the edges $r_0(b_0, a_0), \dots, r_k(b_k, a_k)$ and since $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_V \models C_0(a_0) \vee \dots \vee C_k(a_k)$, we thus find at least one b_i such that $b_i^{\mathcal{I}} \in (\exists r_i.C_i)^{\mathcal{I}}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{I} \models q(b)$.

“ $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}^u \not\models q(b)$ ” (sketch). Consider the elements $brb_i r_i a_i$ in $\mathcal{A}^u$. Each such element is the root of a copy of the unraveling $\mathcal{A}_V^u$ of $\mathcal{A}_V$, restricted to those individuals in $\mathcal{A}_V$ that are reachable from a_i . Since $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}_V \not\models C_i(a_i)$, we find a model $\mathcal{I}_i$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}_V$ with $a_i^{\mathcal{I}_i} \notin C_i^{\mathcal{I}_i}$. By unraveling $\mathcal{I}_i$, we obtain a model $\mathcal{I}_i^u$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}_V^u$ with $a_i^{\mathcal{I}_i^u} \notin C_i^{\mathcal{I}_i^u}$. Combining the models $\mathcal{I}_0^u, \dots, \mathcal{I}_k^u$ in a suitable way, one can craft a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}_V^u$ such that $brb_i r_i a_i^{\mathcal{I}} \notin C_i^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $i \leq k$. Consequently, $\mathcal{I} \not\models q(b)$. $\square$

5. DICHOTOMY FOR DEPTH ONE

In practical applications, the concepts used in TBoxes are often of very limited quantifier depth. Motivated by this observation, we consider TBoxes of *depth one* which are sets of CIs $C \sqsubseteq D$ such that the maximum nesting depth of the constructors $\exists r.E$ and $\forall r.E$ in C and D is one. To confirm that this is indeed a practically relevant case, we have analyzed the 429 ontologies in the BioPortal repository,³ finding that after removing all constructors that are not part of $\mathcal{ALCFI}$, more than 80% of them are of depth one. The main result of this section is a dichotomy between PTIME and CONP for TBoxes of depth one which is established by proving a converse of Theorem 25, that is, showing that materializability implies unraveling tolerance (and thus PTIME query evaluation and even Datalog[≠]-rewritability by Theorem 24) for TBoxes of depth one. Together with Theorem 18, which says that non-materializability implies CONP-hardness, this yields the dichotomy.

We remark that the same strategy cannot be used to obtain a dichotomy in the case of unrestricted depth. In particular, the well-known technique of rewriting a TBox into depth one by introducing fresh concept names can change its complexity because it enables querying for concepts such as $\neg A$ or $\forall r.A$ which are otherwise ‘invisible’ to (positive existential) queries. For TBoxes of unrestricted depth (and even in $\mathcal{ALC}$) it is in fact neither the case that PTIME query evaluation implies unraveling tolerance nor that PTIME query evaluation implies Datalog[≠] rewritability nor that materializability implies PTIME query evaluation. As an example for the former, we show in Section 6 how the TBox $\mathcal{T}_2$ from Example 2, which encodes 2-colorability, can be modified to have PTIME query evaluation. However, 2-colorability is not invariant under tree unravelings and, consequently, $\mathcal{T}_2$ is not unraveling tolerant. Also the latter two statements follow from results established in Section 6.

Theorem 26. *Every materializable $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox of depth one is unraveling tolerant.*

³The ontologies are available at <https://bioportal.bioontology.org/ontologies>.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a materializable TBox of depth one, $\mathcal{A}$ an ABox, $C_0(x)$ an ELIQ, and $a_0 \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models C_0(a_0)$. We have to show that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models C_0(a_0)$. It follows from $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models C_0(a_0)$ that $\mathcal{A}^u$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. There must thus be a materialization $\mathcal{I}^u$ for $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}^u$, despite the fact that $\mathcal{A}^u$ is infinite: by Theorem 26, $\mathcal{T}$ has the disjunction property and the argument from the proof of Theorem 26 that the disjunction property implies materializability goes through without modification also for infinite ABoxes. Our aim is to turn $\mathcal{I}^u$ into a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models C_0(a_0)$. To achieve this, we first uniformize $\mathcal{I}^u$ in a suitable way.

We assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathcal{I}^u$ has forest-shape, i.e., that $\mathcal{I}^u$ can be constructed by selecting a tree-shaped interpretation $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ with root α for each $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, then taking the disjoint union of all these interpretations, and finally adding role edges (α, β) to $r^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ whenever $r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$. In fact, to achieve the desired shape we can take the i-unfolding of $\mathcal{I}^u$ defined and analysed in Lemmas 13 and 14, where we start the i-unfolding from the elements of $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u) \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}^u}$.

We start with exhibiting a self-similarity inside the unraveled ABox $\mathcal{A}^u$ and inside $\mathcal{I}^u$.

Claim 1. For all $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $\text{tail}(\alpha) = \text{tail}(\beta)$,

- (1) $\mathcal{A}^u \models C(\alpha)$ iff $\mathcal{A}^u \models C(\beta)$ for all ELIQs $C(x)$;
- (2) $\alpha \in C^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ iff $\beta \in C^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ for all concepts C built only from concept names, $\neg$, and $\sqcap$.

To establish Point (1), take $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ such that $\text{tail}(\alpha) = \text{tail}(\beta)$ and $\mathcal{A}^u \not\models C(\alpha)$. Then there is a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{A}^u$ and $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models C(\alpha)$. One can find a model $\mathcal{J}$ of $\mathcal{A}^u$ and $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{J} \models C(\beta)$, as follows. By construction of $\mathcal{A}^u$, there is an isomorphism $\iota : \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u) \rightarrow \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $\iota(\alpha) = \beta$ such that $A(\gamma) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ iff $A(\iota(\gamma)) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ and $r(\gamma, \gamma') \in \mathcal{A}^u$ iff $r(\iota(\gamma), \iota(\gamma')) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ for all $\gamma \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, all concept names A , and all role names r . We obtain $\mathcal{J}$ from $\mathcal{I}$ by renaming each $\gamma \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $\iota(\gamma)$. Point (2) can be proved by a straightforward induction on C . The base case uses Point (1) and the fact that $\mathcal{I}^u$ is a materialization of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. This finishes the proof of Claim 1.

Now for the announced uniformization of $\mathcal{I}^u$. What we want to achieve is that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, $\text{tail}(\alpha) = \text{tail}(\beta)$ implies $\mathcal{I}_\alpha = \mathcal{I}_\beta$ (recall that $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ is the tree component of $\mathcal{I}^u$ rooted at α , and likewise for $\mathcal{I}_\beta$). Construct the interpretation $\mathcal{J}^u$ as follows:

- for each $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $\text{tail}(\alpha) = a$, take a copy $\mathcal{J}_\alpha$ of $\mathcal{I}_a$ with the root a renamed to α ;
- then $\mathcal{J}^u$ is the disjoint union of all interpretations $\mathcal{J}_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, extended with a role edge $(\alpha, \beta) \in r^{\mathcal{J}^u}$ whenever $r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$.

Our next aim is to show that $\mathcal{J}^u$ is as required, that is, it is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}^u$ and satisfies $\mathcal{J}^u \not\models C_0(a_0)$.

It is indeed straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{J}^u$ is a model of $\mathcal{A}^u$: all role assertions are satisfied by construction; moreover, $A(\alpha) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ implies $A(a) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ where $a = \text{tail}(\alpha)$, thus $a \in A^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ and $\alpha \in A^{\mathcal{J}^u}$.

Next, we show that $\mathcal{J}^u$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$. Let $f : \Delta^{\mathcal{J}^u} \rightarrow \Delta^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ be a mapping that assigns to each domain element of $\mathcal{J}^u$ the original element in $\mathcal{I}^u$ of which it is a copy.

Claim 2. $d \in C^{\mathcal{J}^u}$ iff $f(d) \in C^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ for all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}^u}$ and $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -concepts C of depth one.

The proof of claim 2 is by induction on the structure of C . We assume w.l.o.g. that C is built only from the constructors $\neg$, $\sqcap$, and $\exists r.C$. The base case, where C is a concept name, is an immediate consequence of the definition of $\mathcal{J}^u$. The case where $C = \neg D$ and $C = D_1 \sqcap D_2$ is routine. It thus remains to consider the case $C = \exists r.D$, where D is built from $\neg$ and $\sqcap$ only.

First let $d \in C^{\mathcal{J}^u}$. Then there is a $(d, e) \in r^{\mathcal{J}^u}$ with $e \in D^{\mathcal{J}^u}$. First assume that the edge (d, e) was added to $r^{\mathcal{J}^u}$ because $d = \alpha$ and $e = \beta$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$. Let $\text{tail}(\alpha) = a$ and $\text{tail}(\beta) = b$. Then we have $f(\alpha) = a$ and $f(\beta) = b$. By construction of

$\mathcal{A}^u$, $r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ implies that $\beta = \alpha r b$ or $\alpha = \beta r^- a$. In both cases we have $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$, thus $r(a, arb) \in \mathcal{A}^u$, thus $(a, arb) \in r^{\mathcal{I}^u}$. Since $\beta = e \in D^{\mathcal{J}^u}$, induction hypothesis yields that $b \in D^{\mathcal{I}^u}$. From Point (2) of Claim 1, we obtain $arb \in D^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ and we are done. Now assume that there is an $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ such that $(d, e) \in \mathcal{J}_\alpha$. By construction of $\mathcal{J}^u$, we then have $(f(d), f(e)) \in r^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ and induction hypothesis yields $f(e) \in D^{\mathcal{I}^u}$.

Now let $f(d) \in C^{\mathcal{I}^u}$. Then there is an $(f(d), e) \in r^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ with $e \in D^{\mathcal{I}^u}$. First assume that $f(d) = \alpha$ and $e = \beta$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ with $r(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$. Since $f(d) \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, we must have $d = \gamma \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ and $f(d) = a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ with $\text{tail}(\gamma) = a$. By construction of $\mathcal{A}^u$, $r(a, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ implies that $\beta = arb$, thus $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$, thus $r(\gamma, \delta) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ with (i) $\delta = \gamma r b$ or (ii) $\gamma = \delta r^- a$ and $\text{tail}(\delta) = b$. Since $arb = e \in D^{\mathcal{I}^u}$, Point (2) of Claim 1 yields $b \in D^{\mathcal{I}^u}$. Since $\text{tail}(\delta) = b$ implies $f(\delta) = b$, induction hypothesis yields $\delta \in D^{\mathcal{I}^u}$ and we are done. Now assume that there is an $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ such that $(f(d), e) \in \mathcal{I}_\alpha$. By construction of $\mathcal{J}^u$, $f(d)$ being in $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ implies that $\alpha = a$ for some $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and that there is an $\alpha' \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ such that d is in $\mathcal{J}_{\alpha'}$ and $\text{tail}(\alpha') = a$. Again by construction of $\mathcal{J}^u$, we thus find an $e' \in \mathcal{J}_{\alpha'}$ with $f(e') = e$ and $(d, e') \in r^{\mathcal{J}_{\alpha'}} \subseteq r^{\mathcal{J}^u}$. Induction hypothesis yields $e' \in D^{\mathcal{J}^u}$. This finishes the proof of Claim 2.

It follows from Claim 2 that $\mathcal{J}^u$ satisfies all CIs in $\mathcal{T}$. To show that $\mathcal{J}^u$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$, it remains to show that $\mathcal{J}^u$ satisfies all functionality assertions. Thus, let $\text{func}(r) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{J}^u}$. If $d \notin \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, then it is straightforward to verify that, by construction of $\mathcal{J}^u$, d has at most one r -successor in $\mathcal{J}^u$. Now assume $d = \alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$ and let $\text{tail}(\alpha) = a$. By construction of $\mathcal{J}^u$ and $\mathcal{A}^u$, α has the same number of r -successors in $\mathcal{J}^u$ as a in $\mathcal{I}^u$. Since $\mathcal{I}^u$ satisfies $\text{func}(r)$, α can have at most one r -successor in $\mathcal{J}^u$.

The final condition that $\mathcal{J}^u$ should satisfy is $\mathcal{J}^u \not\models C_0(a_0)$. Assume to the contrary. We view $C_0(x_0)$ as a (tree-shaped) CQ. Take a homomorphism h from $C_0(x_0)$ to $\mathcal{J}^u$ with $h(x_0) = a_0$. (In this proof we consider homomorphisms that do not have to preserve any individual names.) Let the CQ $q(x)$ be obtained from $C_0(x_0)$ by identifying variables y_1, y_2 whenever $h(y_1) = h(y_2)$. To achieve a contradiction, it suffices to exhibit a homomorphism h' from $q(x_0)$ to $\mathcal{I}^u$ with $h'(x_0) = a_0$. We start with setting $h'(x) = h(x)$ whenever $h(x) \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$. Let q' be obtained from $q(x_0)$ by dropping all role atoms $r(x, y)$ with $h'(x)$ and $h'(y)$ already defined (which are satisfied under h' by construction of $\mathcal{J}^u$ and since $\mathcal{I}^u$ is a model of $\mathcal{A}$). Because of the forest shape of $\mathcal{J}^u$ and by construction, q' is a disjoint union of ELIQs such that, in each ELIQ $C(x)$ contained in q' , h' is defined for the root x of $C(x)$, but not for any other variable in it. Consequently, it suffices to show that whenever $\mathcal{J}_\alpha \models C(\alpha)$ for some ELIQ $C(x)$ and $\alpha \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}^u)$, then $\mathcal{I}^u \models C(\alpha)$; the remaining part of h' can then be constructed in a straightforward way. Now $\mathcal{J}_\alpha \models C(\alpha)$ implies $\mathcal{I}_a \models C(a)$ where $a = \text{tail}(\alpha)$ by choice of $\mathcal{J}_\alpha$, which yields $\mathcal{I}^u \models C(a)$ and thus $\mathcal{I}^u \models C(\alpha)$ by Point (1) of Claim 1.

This finishes the construction and analysis of the uniform model $\mathcal{J}^u$. It remains to convert $\mathcal{J}^u$ into a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and the original ABox $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{I} \not\models C_0(a_0)q$:

- take the disjoint union of the components $\mathcal{J}_a$ of $\mathcal{J}^u$, for each $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$;
- add the edge (a, b) to $r^{\mathcal{I}}$ whenever $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$.

It is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{A}$: all role assertions are satisfied by construction of $\mathcal{I}$; moreover, $A(a) \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $A(a) \in \mathcal{A}^u$ implies $a \in A^{\mathcal{J}^u}$ implies $a \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$. To show that $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and that $\mathcal{I} \not\models C_0(a_0)$, we first observe the following. A *bisimulation between interpretations* $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ is a relation $S \subseteq \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_1} \times \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ such that

- (1) for all $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$ and $(d_1, d_2) \in S$: $d_1 \in A^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ iff $d_2 \in A^{\mathcal{I}_2}$;
- (2) for all $r \in \mathbf{N}_R \cup \{s^- \mid s \in \mathbf{N}_R\}$: if $(d_1, d_2) \in S$ and $(d_1, d'_1) \in r^{\mathcal{I}_1}$, then there exists $d'_2 \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ such that $(d'_1, d'_2) \in S$ and $(d_2, d'_2) \in r^{\mathcal{I}_2}$;

- (3) for all $r \in \mathbb{N}_R \cup \{s^- \mid s \in \mathbb{N}_R\}$: if $(d_1, d_2) \in S$ and $(d_2, d'_2) \in r^{\mathcal{I}_2}$, then there exists $d'_1 \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ such that $(d'_1, d'_2) \in S$ and $(d_1, d'_1) \in r^{\mathcal{I}_1}$.

Recall that, whenever there is a bisimulation S between $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ with $(d, e) \in S$, then $d \in C^{\mathcal{I}_1}$ iff $e \in C^{\mathcal{I}_2}$ for all $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -concepts C [GO07, LPW11].

Claim 3. There is a bisimulation S between $\mathcal{J}^u$ and $\mathcal{I}$ such that $(a, a) \in S$ for all $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$.

Since $\mathcal{J}^u$ is uniform in the sense that $\mathcal{J}_\alpha$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{J}_\beta$ whenever $\text{tail}(\alpha) = \text{tail}(\beta)$, we find a bisimulation between $\mathcal{J}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{J}_a$ whenever $\text{tail}(\alpha) = a$. It can be verified that the union of all these bisimulations qualifies as the desired bisimulation S for Claim 3. Thus, Claim 3 is proved.

It follows from Claim 3 that $\mathcal{I}$ satisfies all concept inclusions in $\mathcal{T}$, and that $\mathcal{I} \not\models C_0(a_0)$. It thus remains to verify that $\mathcal{I}$ also satisfies all functionality assertions in $\mathcal{T}$. This can be done in the same way in which we have verified that $\mathcal{J}^u$ satisfies all those assertions. $\square$

The desired dichotomy follows: If an $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ of depth one is materializable, then PEQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME and Datalog[≠]-rewritable by Theorems 26 and 24. Otherwise, ELIQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-complete by Theorem 18.

Theorem 27 (Dichotomy). *For every $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ of depth one, one of the following is true:*

- *Q-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME for any $Q \in \{\text{PEQ}, \text{CQ}, \text{ELIQ}\}$ (and Datalog[≠]-rewritable);*
- *Q-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-complete for any $Q \in \{\text{PEQ}, \text{CQ}, \text{ELIQ}\}$.*

6. QUERY EVALUATION IN $\mathcal{ALC}/\mathcal{ALCI} = \text{CSP}$

We show that query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALC}$ - and $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBoxes has the same computational power as non-uniform CSPs in the following sense:

- (1) for every CSP, there is an $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ such that the CSP can be reduced in polynomial time to the complement of evaluating an OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, \exists x M(x))$ and, conversely, for every OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, q)$ query evaluation can be reduced in polynomial time to the CSP's complement;
- (2) for every OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, q)$ with $\mathcal{T}$ an $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBox and q an ELIQ, there is a CSP such that the complement of the CSP and the query evaluation problem for the $(\mathcal{T}, q)$ are reducible to each other in polynomial time.

This result has many interesting consequences. In particular, the Feder-Vardi conjecture holds if and only if there is a PTIME/CONP-dichotomy for query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBoxes (equivalently: w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBoxes). Remarkably, all this is true already for *materializable* TBoxes. By Theorem 19 and since we carefully choose the appropriate query language in each technical result below, it furthermore holds for any of the query languages ELIQ, CQ, and PEQ (and ELQ for $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBoxes).

We begin by introducing CSPs. Since every CSP is equivalent to a CSP with a single predicate that is binary, up to polynomial time reductions [FV93], we consider CSPs over unary and binary predicates (concept names and role names) only. A *signature* Σ is a finite set of concept and role names. An ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is a Σ -ABox if all concept and role names in $\mathcal{A}$ are in Σ . For two finite Σ -ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, we write $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ if there is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ that does not have to preserve any individual names. Any Σ -ABox $\mathcal{B}$ gives rise to the following (non-uniform) constraint satisfaction problem

- **CSP($\mathcal{B}$)**: given a finite Σ -ABox $\mathcal{A}$, decide whether $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.

$\mathcal{B}$ is called the *template* of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$. Many algorithmic problems can be given in the form $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$. For example, k -colorability is $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{C}_k)$, where $\mathcal{C}_k$ is the $\{r\}$ -ABox containing $r(i, j)$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq k$.

We now formulate and prove Points (1) and (2) from above, starting with (1).

Theorem 28. *For every template $\mathcal{B}$, one can construct in polynomial time a materializable $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$ such that, for a distinguished concept name M , the following hold:*

- (1) $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is polynomial time reducible to the complement of the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, \exists x M(x))$;
- (2) the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, q)$ is polynomial time reducible to the complement of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$, for all PEQs q .

Our approach to proving Theorem 28 is to generalize the reduction of k -colorability to query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBoxes discussed in Examples 2 and 4, where the main challenge is to overcome the observation from Example 4 that PTIME CSPs such as 2-colorability may be translated into CONP-hard TBoxes. Note that this is due to the disjunction in the TBox $\mathcal{T}_k$ of Example 2, which causes non-materializability. Our solution is to replace the concept names $A_1, \dots, A_k$ in $\mathcal{T}_k$ with suitable compound concepts that are ‘invisible to the (positive existential) query’. Unlike the original depth one TBox $\mathcal{T}_k$, the resulting TBox is of depth three. We first define and analyze the replacement of concept names by compound concepts in some detail (as this will be reused later in the paper again) and then return to the proof of Theorem 28.

Let Σ be a set of concept names. For any $B \in \Sigma$, let Z_B be a fresh concept name and let r_B and s_B be fresh role names. The *abstraction* of B is the $\mathcal{ALC}$ -concept $H_B := \forall r_B. \exists s_B. \neg Z_B$. The Σ -*abstraction* C' of a (potentially compound) concept C is obtained from C by replacing every $B \in \Sigma$ with H_B . The Σ -*abstraction* of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{T}$ by replacing all concepts in $\mathcal{T}$ with their Σ -abstractions. We associate with Σ an auxiliary TBox

$$\mathcal{T}^\exists = \{\top \sqsubseteq \exists r_B. \top, \top \sqsubseteq \exists s_B. Z_B \mid B \in \Sigma\}$$

Finally, $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is called the *enriched Σ -abstraction* of $\mathcal{T}$ and Σ . In what follows, we are going to replace TBoxes $\mathcal{T}$ with their enriched abstractions. The following example shows that the TBox $\mathcal{T}^\exists$ is crucial for hiding the concept names in Σ : without $\mathcal{T}^\exists$, disjunctions in $\mathcal{T}$ over concept names from Σ can still induce disjunctions in the Σ -abstraction.

Example 29. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{A \sqsubseteq \neg B_1 \sqcup \neg B_2\}$ and $\Sigma = \{B_1, B_2\}$. Then $\mathcal{T}' = \{A \sqsubseteq \neg H_{B_1} \sqcup \neg H_{B_2}\}$ is the Σ -abstraction of $\mathcal{T}$. For $\mathcal{A} = \{A(a)\}$, we derive $\mathcal{T}', \mathcal{A} \models \exists r_{B_1}. \top(a) \vee \exists r_{B_2}. \top(a)$ but $\mathcal{T}', \mathcal{A} \not\models \exists r_{B_1}. \top(a)$ and $\mathcal{T}', \mathcal{A} \not\models \exists r_{B_2}. \top(a)$. Thus $\mathcal{T}'$ does not have the ABox disjunction property and is not materializable. In contrast, it follows from Lemma 30 below that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is materializable and, in fact, $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(a)$ iff $\mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(a)$ holds for all PEQs q .

We say that a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ *admits trivial models* if the singleton interpretation $\mathcal{I}$ with $X^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$ for all $X \in \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{C}} \cup \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, we write $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma}$ to denote the ABox obtained from the ABox $\mathcal{A}$ by removing all assertions in $\mathcal{A}$ that use a symbol that is not in Σ , and likewise for $\mathcal{A}_{\Sigma}$ and symbols that are in Σ . An ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is *strongly Σ -consistent w.r.t. a TBox $\mathcal{T}$* if there exists a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma}$ such that $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a \mid A(a) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all $A \notin \Sigma$, and $r^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b) \mid r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all role names $r \notin \Sigma$. Thus, strong Σ -consistency formalizes the intuition that we regard the symbols in Σ as existentially quantified second-order variables. The following lemma summarizes the main properties of abstractions. Points (1) and (2) establish a close link between the original TBox and its enriched abstraction. Points (3) and (4) together state that query evaluation is tractable for the enriched abstraction of a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ for ABoxes that are strongly Σ -consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 30. Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ admits trivial models and let Σ be a finite set of concept names and $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ the enriched Σ -abstraction of $\mathcal{T}$. Then for every ABox $\mathcal{A}$ and all $\mathcal{ALCI}$ concepts C not using the fresh symbols from Σ -abstractions:

- (1) $\mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ iff $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$;
- (2) for all $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and the Σ -abstraction C' of C :

$$\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \models C(a) \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models C'(a)$$

and if C is a concept name:

$$\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \models \exists x C(x) \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models \exists x C'(x);$$

- (3) $\mathcal{T}^\exists$ is Datalog[≠]-rewritable for PEQs;
- (4) if $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly $\bar{\Sigma}$ -consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, then

$$\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$$

for all PEQs q and all $\vec{a}$.

Proof. Observe that (1) follows from (2) as we can choose $C = \perp$. Thus we prove (2). Let C' be the Σ -abstraction of C .

We first consider ($\Rightarrow$). Assume $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models C'(a)$. Take a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ and $\mathcal{A}$ that witnesses this. Define an interpretation $\mathcal{J}$ in the same way as $\mathcal{I}$ except that $B^{\mathcal{J}} := H_B^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $B \in \Sigma$. It is straightforward to show for all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ that $d \in D^{\mathcal{J}}$ iff $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$ holds for all $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -concepts D not using the fresh symbols from Σ -abstractions and their Σ -abstractions D' . Thus $\mathcal{J}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}}$ and shows that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \not\models C(a)$ if $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models C'(a)$. The same proof shows that ($\Rightarrow$) holds for queries of the form $\exists x C(x)$ and $\exists x C'(x)$ as well (even if C is not a concept name).

Now consider ($\Leftarrow$). Assume $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \not\models C(a)$ or $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \not\models \exists x A(x)$ (where A is a concept name). Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a model of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}}$ that witnesses this. Construct a model $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ of $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ and $\mathcal{A}$ as follows: $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{can}}$ is the set of words $w = dv_1 \cdots v_n$ such that $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ and $v_i \in \{r_B, s_B, \bar{s}_B \mid B \in \Sigma\}$ where $v_i \neq \bar{s}_B$ if (i) $i > 2$ or (ii) $i = 2$ and $(d \notin H_B^{\mathcal{I}}$ or $v_1 \neq r_B)$. Now let

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} &= A^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ for all concept names } A \notin \Sigma \\ B^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} &= \{d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}) \mid B(d) \in \mathcal{A}\} \text{ for all } B \in \Sigma \\ Z_B^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} &= Z_B^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{w \mid \text{tail}(w) = s_B\} \text{ for all } B \in \Sigma \\ r^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} &= r^{\mathcal{I}} \text{ for all } r \notin \{r_B, s_B \mid r \in \Sigma\} \\ r_B^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} &= r_B^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(w, wr_B) \mid wr_B \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{can}}\} \text{ for all } r \in \Sigma \\ s_B^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} &= s_B^{\mathcal{I}} \cup \{(w, ws_B) \mid wr_B \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{can}}\} \cup \{(w, w\bar{s}_B) \mid w\bar{s}_B \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{can}}\} \text{ for all } r \in \Sigma \end{aligned}$$

By construction of $\mathcal{I}_{can}$, we have $H_B^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} = B^{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $B \in \Sigma$. Thus for all concepts D (not using symbols from Σ -abstractions) and their Σ -abstractions D' and all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$, we have $d \in D'^{\mathcal{I}_{can}}$ iff $d \in D^{\mathcal{I}}$. Thus, the CIs of $\mathcal{T}'$ hold in all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ since the CIs of $\mathcal{T}$ hold in all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$. The CIs of $\mathcal{T}'$ also hold in all $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{can}} \setminus \Delta^{\mathcal{I}}$ since $\mathcal{T}$ admits trivial models. Thus $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}'$. Since $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}^\exists$ by construction, it follows that $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$. It also follows that $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ shows $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models C'(a)$ if $\mathcal{I}$ shows that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \not\models C(a)$ and that $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ shows that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models \exists x A'(x)$ if $\mathcal{I}$ shows that $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \not\models \exists x A(x)$.

(3) is a consequence of the fact that $\mathcal{T}^\exists$ can be viewed as a TBox formulated in the description logic DL-Lite_R and that any OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, q)$ with $\mathcal{T}$ a DL-Lite_R-TBox and q a PEQ is known to be rewritable into a union of CQs [CDGL⁺07, ACKZ09].

(4) Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly $\bar{\Sigma}$ -consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ and that $\mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models q(\vec{a})$. We show $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models q(\vec{a})$. Note first that one can construct a hom-initial model $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}^\exists$ of $\mathcal{T}^\exists$ and $\mathcal{A}$ in the same way as $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ was constructed from $\mathcal{I}$ above (by replacing $\mathcal{I}$ with the interpretation $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}$ corresponding to $\mathcal{A}$ and not using the symbols $\bar{s}_B$ in the construction). Thus, $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}^\exists}$ is the set of words $w = av_1 \cdots v_n$ such that $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and $v_i \in \{r_B, s_B, \mid B \in \Sigma\}$. We have $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}^\exists \not\models q(\vec{a})$. Now, as $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly $\bar{\Sigma}$ -consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, there is a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}}$ with $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a \mid A(a) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all $A \notin \Sigma$, and $r^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b) \mid r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all role names r . Construct the model $\mathcal{I}_{can}$ of $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ and $\mathcal{A}$ in the same way as in the proof of (2). Define a mapping $h : \mathcal{I}_{can} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}}^\exists$ by setting $h(w) = w'$, where w' is obtained from w by replacing every $\bar{s}_B$ by s_B . One can show that h is a homomorphism. Thus $\mathcal{I}_{can} \not\models q(\vec{a})$ and so $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models q(\vec{a})$, as required. The converse direction is trivial. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 28.

Proof of Theorem 28. Assume a Σ_0 -template $\mathcal{B}$ is given. We construct the TBox $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$ in two steps. First take for any $d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})$ a concept name A_d and define a TBox $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$ with the following CIs:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dom} &\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})} A_d \\ A_d \sqcap A_e &\sqsubseteq \perp && \text{for all } d, e \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B}), d \neq e \\ A_d \sqcap \exists r. A_e &\sqsubseteq \perp && \text{for all } d, e \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B}), r \in \Sigma_0, r(d, e) \notin \mathcal{B} \\ A_d \sqcap A &\sqsubseteq \perp && \text{for all } d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B}), A \in \Sigma_0, A(d) \notin \mathcal{B}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\text{dom} \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})} A_d$ stands for the set of CIs

$$\exists r. \top \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})} A_d, \quad A \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})} A_d, \quad \top \sqsubseteq \forall r. (\bigsqcup_{d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})} A_d)$$

where r and A range over all role and concept names in Σ_0 , respectively. We use a CI of the form $\text{dom} \sqsubseteq C$ rather than $\top \sqsubseteq C$ to ensure that the TBox $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$ admits trivial models. Let M be a fresh concept name and set $\Sigma = \{A_d \mid d \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{B})\}$. Then the following can be proved in a straightforward way.

Claim 1. For any ABox $\mathcal{A}$ the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{A}|_{\overline{\Sigma \cup \{M\}}} \not\models \exists x M(x)$;
- (2) $\mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$;
- (3) $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.

Thus, $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ and the complement of the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}, \exists x M(x))$ are reducible to each other in polynomial time. Because of the disjunctions, however, the query evaluation problem w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is typically coNP-hard even if $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is in PTIME. We thus ‘hide’ the concept names A_d by replacing them with their abstractions H_{A_d} . Let $\mathcal{H}'_{\mathcal{B}} \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ be the enriched Σ -abstraction of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$. From Claim 1 and Lemma 30 (1) according to which $\mathcal{A}|_{\bar{\Sigma}}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$ iff $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}'_{\mathcal{B}} \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$, we obtain

Claim 2. For any ABox $\mathcal{A}$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $\mathcal{H}'_{\mathcal{B}} \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A}|_{\overline{\{M\}}} \not\models \exists x M(x)$;
- (2) $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}'_{\mathcal{B}} \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$;
- (3) $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}} = \mathcal{H}'_{\mathcal{B}} \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ be the enriched Σ -abstraction of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$. We show that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is as required to prove Theorem 28.

(1) We have to show that $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is reducible in polynomial time to the complement of the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, \exists x M(x))$. But given a Σ_0 -ABox $\mathcal{A}$, we have by Claim 2 that $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ iff $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{A} \models \exists x M(x)$.

(2) For the converse reduction, let q be a PEQ. We have to show that the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, q)$ is reducible in polynomial time to the complement of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an ABox and $\vec{a}$ from $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$. We show that the following are equivalent:

- (a) $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$;
- (b) $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma_0} \not\rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ or $\mathcal{T}^{\exists}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$.

Regarding (b), we remark that by Lemma 30 (3) $\mathcal{T}^{\exists}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ can be checked in polynomial time and thus can be checked as part of the reduction. First assume that (a) holds. If $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, then by Claim 1 the ABox $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$. Thus there is a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma}$ satisfying $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ and $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a \mid A(a) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all concept names $A \notin \Sigma$ and $r^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b) \mid r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all role names r . Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly Σ -consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B}}$. By Lemma 30 (4) we have $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{T}^{\exists}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ for all PEQs q and all $\vec{a}$, as required.

Conversely, assume (b) holds. If $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma_0} \not\rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, then by Claim 2 $\mathcal{A}$ is not consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and so $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$. If $\mathcal{T}^{\exists}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$, then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ since $\mathcal{T}^{\exists} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$. $\square$

The following converse of Theorem 28 is proved in [BtCLW14].

Theorem 31. *For every $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ and ELIQ $C(x)$, one can compute a template $\mathcal{B}$ in exponential time such that the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}, C(x))$ and the complement of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ are polynomial time reducible to each other.*

The proof of Theorem 31 given in [BtCLW14] proceeds in two steps. To deal with answer variables, it uses *generalized CSPs with constants*, defined by a finite set of templates (instead of a single one) and admitting the inclusion of constant symbols in the signature of the CSP (instead of only relation symbols). One shows that (i) for every OMQ $(\mathcal{T}, C(x))$, one can construct a generalized CSP with a single constant whose complement is mutually reducible in polynomial time with the query evaluation problem for $(\mathcal{T}, C(x))$ and (ii) every generalized CSP with constants is mutually reducible in polynomial time with some standard CSP. For the reader's convenience, we illustrate the construction of the template from a given OMQ, concentrating on *Boolean ELIQs* which are of the form $\exists x C(x)$ with $C(x)$ an ELIQ. In this special case, one can avoid the use of generalized CSPs with constants.

Theorem 32. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBox, $q = \exists x C(x)$ with C an $\mathcal{ELIQ}$, and Σ the signature of $\mathcal{T}$ and q . Then one can construct (in time single exponential in $|\mathcal{T}| + |C|$) a Σ -template $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}, q}$ such that for all ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$:*

$$(\text{HomDual}) \quad \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models q \text{ iff } \mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma} \not\rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}, q}$$

Proof. Assume $\mathcal{T}$ and $q = \exists x C(x)$ are given. We use the notation from the proof of Theorem 24. Thus, $\text{cl}(\mathcal{T}, C)$ denotes the closure under single negation of the set of subconcepts of $\mathcal{T}$ and C , $\text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q)$ denotes the set of $\mathcal{T}, q$ -types and for $t, t' \in \text{tp}(\mathcal{T}, q)$ we write $t \rightsquigarrow_r t'$ if t and t' can be satisfied in domain elements of a model of $\mathcal{T}$ that are related by r . Now, a $\mathcal{T}, q$ -type t *omits* q if it is satisfiable in a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ with $C^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$. Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}, q}$ be the set of assertions $A(t)$ such t omits q and $A \in t$ and $r(t, t')$ such that t and t' omit q and $t \rightsquigarrow_r t'$. It is not difficult to show that condition (HomDual) holds for all ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$. Observe that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}, q}$ can be constructed in exponential time since the set of $\mathcal{T}, q$ -types omitting q can be constructed in exponential time. $\square$

Example 33. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{A \sqsubseteq \forall r.B\}$ and define $q = \exists x B(x)$. Then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T},q}$ is defined, up to isomorphism, as $\{r(a, a), r(a, b), A(b), r(a, c)\}$.

As a consequence of Theorems 28 and 31, we obtain the following.

Theorem 34. *There is a dichotomy between PTIME and CONP for CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBoxes if and only if the Feder-Vardi conjecture is true. The same is true for $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBoxes, for ELIQs, and for PEQs. For $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBoxes, it additionally holds for ELQs.*

Proof. Let $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ be an NP-intermediate CSP, i.e., a CSP that is neither in PTIME nor NP-hard. Take the TBox $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$ from Theorem 28. By Point 1 of that theorem, CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is not in PTIME. By Point 2, CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is not CONP-hard.

Conversely, let $\mathcal{T}$ be an $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBox for which CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is neither in PTIME nor CONP-hard. Then by Theorem 19, the same holds for ELIQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. It follows that there is a concrete ELIQ q such that query evaluation for $(\mathcal{T}, q)$ is CONP-intermediate. By Theorem 31, there is a template $\mathcal{B}$ such that evaluating $(\mathcal{T}, q)$ is mutually reducible in polynomial time with the complement of $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$. Thus $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{B})$ is NP-intermediate, as required. $\square$

Observe that the TBox constructed in the proof of Theorem 28 has depth three. Thus, a dichotomy between PTIME and CONP for CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALC}$ -TBoxes of depth three would imply that the Feder-Vardi conjecture is true. On the other hand, we have proved a dichotomy between PTIME and CONP for CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBoxes of depth one. The behavior of TBoxes of depth two remains open.

7. NON-DICHOTOMY AND UNDECIDABILITY IN $\mathcal{ALCF}$

We show that the complexity landscape of query evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes is much richer than for $\mathcal{ALCI}$, and in fact too rich to be fully manageable. In particular, we prove that for CQ-evaluation, there is no dichotomy between PTIME and CONP (unless $\text{PTIME} = \text{NP}$). We also establish that materializability, Datalog[≠]-rewritability, PTIME query evaluation, and CONP-hardness of query evaluation are undecidable. We start with the undecidability proofs, which are by reduction of an undecidable rectangle tiling problem and reuse the ‘hidden concepts’ introduced in the previous section. Next, the TBox from that reduction is adapted to prove the non-dichotomy result by an encoding of the computations of nondeterministic polynomial time Turing machines (and again using hidden concepts). The basis for the technical development in this section is a TBox constructed in [BBLW16] to prove the undecidability of *query emptiness* in $\mathcal{ALCF}$.

An instance of the finite rectangle tiling problem is given by a triple $\mathfrak{P} = (\mathfrak{T}, H, V)$ with $\mathfrak{T}$ a finite set of *tile types* including an *initial tile* T_{init} to be placed on the lower left corner and a *final tile* T_{final} to be placed on the upper right corner, $H \subseteq \mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{T}$ a *horizontal matching relation*, and $V \subseteq \mathfrak{T} \times \mathfrak{T}$ a *vertical matching relation*. A *tiling* for $(\mathfrak{T}, H, V)$ is a map $f : \{0, \dots, n\} \times \{0, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}$ such that $n, m \geq 0$, $f(0, 0) = T_{\text{init}}$, $f(n, m) = T_{\text{final}}$, $(f(i, j), f(i + 1, j)) \in H$ for all $i < n$, and $(f(i, j), f(i, j + 1)) \in V$ for all $i < m$. We say that $\mathfrak{P}$ *admits a tiling* if there exists a map f that is a tiling for $\mathfrak{P}$. It is undecidable whether an instance of the finite rectangle tiling problem admits a tiling.

Now let $\mathfrak{P} = (\mathfrak{T}, H, V)$ be a finite rectangle tiling problem with $\mathfrak{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_p\}$. We regard the tile types in $\mathfrak{T}$ as concept names and set $\Sigma_g = \{T_1, \dots, T_p, x, y, \hat{x}, \hat{y}\}$, where $x, y, \hat{x}$, and $\hat{y}$ are *functional* role names. The TBox $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is defined as the following set of CIs, where (T_i, T_j, T_ℓ) range over all triples from $\mathfrak{T}$ such that $(T_i, T_j) \in H$ and $(T_i, T_\ell) \in V$ and where for $e \in \{c, x, y\}$

the concept B_e ranges over all conjunctions $L_1 \sqcap L_2$ with $L_i \in \{Z_{e,i}, \neg Z_{e,i}\}$, for concept names $Z_{e,i}$ ($i = 1, 2$):

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{\text{final}} &\sqsubseteq Y \sqcap U \sqcap R \\
\exists x.(U \sqcap Y \sqcap T_j) \sqcap I_x \sqcap T_i &\sqsubseteq U \sqcap Y \\
\exists y.(R \sqcap Y \sqcap T_\ell) \sqcap I_y \sqcap T_i &\sqsubseteq R \sqcap Y \\
\exists x.(T_j \sqcap Y \sqcap \exists y.Y) \sqcap \exists y.(T_\ell \sqcap Y \sqcap \exists x.Y) \sqcap I_x \sqcap I_y \sqcap C \sqcap T_i &\sqsubseteq Y \\
Y \sqcap T_{\text{init}} &\sqsubseteq A \\
B_x \sqcap \exists x.\exists \hat{x}.B_x &\sqsubseteq I_x \\
B_y \sqcap \exists y.\exists \hat{y}.B_y &\sqsubseteq I_y \\
\exists x.\exists y.B_c \sqcap \exists y.\exists x.B_c &\sqsubseteq C \\
\bigcup_{1 \leq s < t \leq p} T_s \sqcap T_t &\sqsubseteq \perp \\
U &\sqsubseteq \forall y.\perp \quad R \sqsubseteq \forall x.\perp \quad U \sqsubseteq \forall x.U \quad R \sqsubseteq \forall y.R \\
Y \sqcap T_{\text{init}} &\sqsubseteq D \sqcap L \quad D \sqsubseteq \forall \hat{y}.\perp \quad L \sqsubseteq \forall \hat{x}.\perp \quad D \sqsubseteq \forall x.D \sqcap \forall \hat{x}.D \quad L \sqsubseteq \forall y.L \sqcap \forall \hat{y}.L
\end{aligned}$$

With the exception of the CIs in the last line, the TBox $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ has been defined and analyzed in [BBLW16]. Here, we briefly give intuition and discuss its main properties. The role names x and y are used to represent horizontal and vertical adjacency of points in a rectangle. The role names $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}$ are used to simulate the inverses of x and y . The concept names in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ serve the following purposes:

- U , R , L , and D mark the upper, right, left, and lower (‘down’) border of the rectangle.
- In the B_c concepts, the concept names $Z_{c,1}$ and $Z_{c,2}$ serve as second-order variables and ensure that a flag C is set at positions where the grid cell is closed.
- In the concepts B_x and B_y , the concept names $Z_{x,1}$, $Z_{x,2}$, $Z_{y,1}$, $Z_{y,2}$ also serve as second-order variables and ensure that flags I_x and I_y are set at positions where x and $\hat{x}$ as well as y and $\hat{y}$ are inverse to each other.
- The concept name Y is propagated through the grid from the upper right corner to the lower left one, ensuring that these flags are set everywhere, that every position of the grid is labeled with at least one tile type, and that the horizontal and vertical matching conditions are satisfied.
- Finally, when the lower left corner of the grid is reached, the concept name A is set as a flag.

Because of the use of the concepts B_e , CQ evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is coNP-hard: we leave it as an exercise to the reader to verify that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ does not have the ABox disjunction property. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ without the three CIs involving the concepts B_e , however, is (equivalent to) a Horn- $\mathcal{ALCF}$ TBox and thus enjoys PTIME CQ-evaluation. It can also be verified that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ admits trivial models. Call a Σ_g -ABox $\mathcal{A}$ a *grid ABox (with initial individual a)* if $\mathcal{A}$ represents a grid along with a proper tiling for $\mathfrak{P}$. In detail, we require that there is a tiling f for $\mathfrak{P}$ with domain $\{0, \dots, n\} \times \{0, \dots, m\}$ and a bijection $g : \{0, \dots, n\} \times \{0, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ with $g(0, 0) = a$ such that

- for all $j < n, k \leq m$: $T(g(j, k)) \in \mathcal{A}$ iff $T = f(j, k)$;
- for all $b_1, b_2 \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$: $x(b_1, b_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ iff $\hat{x}(b_2, b_1) \in \mathcal{A}$ iff there are $j < n, k \leq m$ such that $(b_1, b_2) = (g(j, k), g(j + 1, k))$;
- for all $b_1, b_2 \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$: $y(b_1, b_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ iff $\hat{y}(b_2, b_1) \in \mathcal{A}$ iff there are $j \leq n, k < m$ such that $(b_1, b_2) = (g(j, k), g(j, k + 1))$.

Clearly, if $\mathfrak{P}$ admits a tiling then a grid ABox exists and for any grid ABox $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \models A(a)$ for the (uniquely determined) initial individual a of $\mathcal{A}$. The following summarizes relevant properties of Σ_g -ABoxes that follow almost directly from the analysis of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ in [BBLW16]. We say that an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ contains an ABox $\mathcal{A}'$ if $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ and that $\mathcal{A}$ contains a closed ABox $\mathcal{A}$ if, additionally, $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a \in \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}')$ implies $r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}'$ for $r \in \{x, y, \hat{x}, \hat{y}\}$. Moreover, we say that inconsistency of $(\Sigma\text{-})$ ABoxes w.r.t. a TBox $\mathcal{T}$ is *Datalog $^\neq$ -rewritable* if there is a Boolean Datalog $^\neq$ -program Π such that for any $(\Sigma\text{-})$ ABox $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{A} \models \Pi()$ iff $\mathcal{A}$ is inconsistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 35. *Let $\mathfrak{P}$ be a finite rectangle tiling problem. Then the following holds.*

- (1) *Inconsistency of Σ_g -ABoxes w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is Datalog $^\neq$ -rewritable.*
- (2) *If a Σ_g -ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$, then it is Σ_g -strongly consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ contains*
 - *closed grid ABoxes $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$, $n \geq 0$, with mutually disjoint sets $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_i)$ and*
 - *a (possibly empty) Σ_g -ABox $\mathcal{A}'$ disjoint from $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n$**such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \models A(a)$ iff a is the initial node of some $\mathcal{A}_i$. Moreover, there is a model $\mathcal{I}$ witnessing Σ_g -strong consistency w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ that satisfies $a \in A^\mathcal{I}$ iff a is the initial node of some $\mathcal{A}_i$.*

Proof. (1) Assume a Σ_g -ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is given. Apply the following rules exhaustively to $\mathcal{A}$:

- (a) add $I_x(a)$ to $\mathcal{A}$ if there exists b with $x(a, b), \hat{x}(b, a) \in \mathcal{A}$;
- (b) add $I_y(a)$ to $\mathcal{A}$ if there exists b with $y(a, b), \hat{y}(b, a) \in \mathcal{A}$;
- (c) add $C(a)$ to $\mathcal{A}$ if there exist a_1, a_2, b with $x(a, a_1), y(a, a_2), y(a_1, b), x(a_2, b) \in \mathcal{A}$.

Denote the resulting ABox by $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$. Now remove the three CIs involving the concepts B_e from $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ and denote by $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}^\dagger$ the resulting TBox. Using the analysis of the CIs involving the concepts B_e in [BBLW16], one can show that $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ iff $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}^\dagger$. Since the latter is a Horn- $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox, it is unraveling tolerant and one can build a Datalog $^\neq$ -rewriting of the inconsistency of Σ_g -ABoxes w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}^\dagger$, essentially as in the proof of Theorem 24. Finally, the obtained program can be modified so as to behave as if started on $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$ when started on $\mathcal{A}$, by implementing rules (a) to (c) as Datalog rules.

(2) This is almost a direct consequence of the properties established in [BBLW16]. In particular, one finds the desired model $\mathcal{I}$ from the ‘moreover’ part by applying the three rules from the proof of Point (1) and then applying the CIs in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}^\dagger$ as rules. The only condition on the decomposition of the ABox $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}'$ that does not follow from [BBLW16] is that the containment of $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is closed also for the role names $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}$. To ensure this condition, we use the CIs that mention L and D that were not present in the TBox used in that paper. In fact, the following two properties follow directly from these CIs: (i) the individuals c reachable along an x -path in $\mathcal{A}$ from some a with $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \models A(a)$ all satisfy $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \models D(c)$ and so do not have an $\hat{x}$ -successor; and (ii) the individuals c reachable along a y -path in $\mathcal{A}$ from some a with $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \models A(a)$ all satisfy $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \models L(c)$ and so do not have a $\hat{y}$ -successor. (i) and (ii) together with the properties established in [BBLW16] entail that the containment of $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is closed also for the role names $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}$, as required. $\square$

Note that it follows from Lemma 35 (2) that if $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, then the sequence $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$ is empty iff $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \not\models \exists x A(x)$ (and $\mathcal{A}'$ is non-empty since ABoxes are non-empty). In particular this must be the case when $\mathfrak{P}$ does not admit a tiling. In the proof Lemma 36 below, this is actually

all we need from Lemma 35 (2). In full generality, it will only be used in the proof of non-dichotomy later on. We also remark that the decomposition $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}'$ of $\mathcal{A}$ in Lemma 35 (2) is unique.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}} \cup \{A \sqsubseteq B_1 \sqcup B_2\}$, where B_1 and B_2 are fresh concept names. Set $\Sigma = \text{sig}(\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}) \setminus \Sigma_g$ and let $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ be the enriched Σ -abstraction of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 36.

- (1) If $\mathfrak{P}$ admits a tiling, then CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is CONP-hard and $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is not materializable.
- (2) If $\mathfrak{P}$ does not admit a tiling, then CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is $\text{Datalog}^\neq$ -rewritable and $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is materializable.

Proof. (1) If $\mathfrak{P}$ admits a tiling, then there is a grid ABox $\mathcal{A}$ with initial node a . $\mathcal{A}$ uses symbols from Σ_g , only. We have $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A} \models A(a)$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$. Thus $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \models B_1 \sqcup B_2(a)$ and $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models B_i(a)$ for $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 30 (2), $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models B_1 \sqcup B_2(a)$ and $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models B_i(a)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ does not have the ABox disjunction property. It follows that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is not materializable and that CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is CONP-hard .

(2) Assume that $\mathfrak{P}$ does not admit a tiling. Let q be a PEQ. We show how to construct a $\text{Datalog}^\neq$ -rewriting Π of $(\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, q)$. On ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$ that are inconsistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$, Π is supposed to return all tuples over $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$ of the same arity as q . By Lemma 30 (1), an ABox $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ iff $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. It thus follows from Lemma 35 (1) that inconsistency of ABoxes w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ is $\text{Datalog}^\neq$ -rewritable. From a concrete rewriting, we can build a $\text{Datalog}^\neq$ -program Π_0 that checks inconsistency and, if successful, returns all answers.

Now for ABoxes $\mathcal{A}$ that are consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$. By Lemma 30 (1), $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$. Since $\mathfrak{P}$ does not admit a tiling and by Lemma 35 (2), $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}, \mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma} \not\models \exists x A(x)$. Thus, by Lemma 35 (2) we find a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ and $\mathcal{A}|_{\Sigma}$ such that $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A})$, $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \{a \mid A(a) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all $A \notin \Sigma$, $r^{\mathcal{I}} = \{(a, b) \mid r(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for all role names r , and $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$. Since $A^{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{I}$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}$. From Lemma 30 (4), we thus obtain that $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$, for all $\vec{a}$. By Lemma 30 (3), $(\mathcal{T}^\exists, q)$ is $\text{Datalog}^\neq$ -rewritable into a program Π_1 .

The desired program Π is simply the union of Π_0 and Π_1 , assuming disjointness of IDB relations. $\square$

Lemma 36 implies the announced undecidability results.

Theorem 37. For $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBoxes $\mathcal{T}$, the following problems are undecidable (Points 1 and 2 are subject to the side condition that $\text{PTIME} \neq \text{NP}$):

- (1) CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is in PTIME ;
- (2) CQ-evaluation w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ is CONP-hard ;
- (3) $\mathcal{T}$ is $\text{Datalog}^\neq$ -rewritable;
- (4) $\mathcal{T}$ is materializable.

We now come to the proof of non-dichotomy.

Theorem 38. For every language $L \in \text{CONP}$, there exists an $\mathcal{ALCF}$ -TBox $\mathcal{T}$ such that, for a distinguished concept name M_0 , the following holds:

- (1) L is polynomial time reducible to the evaluation of $(\mathcal{T}, \exists x M_0(x))$;
- (2) the evaluation of $(\mathcal{T}, q)$ is polynomial time reducible to L , for all PEQs q .

To prove Theorem 38 let $L \in \text{CONP}$. Take a non-deterministic polynomial time Turing Machine M that recognizes the complement of L . Let $M = (Q, \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, \Delta, q_0, q_a, q_r)$ with Q a finite set of states, Γ_0 and Γ_1 finite input and tape alphabets such that $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_1 \setminus \Gamma_0$ contains the blank symbol β , $q_0 \in Q$ the starting state, $\Delta \subseteq Q \times \Gamma_1 \times Q \times \Gamma_1 \times \{L, R\}$ the transition relation, and $q_a, q_r \in Q$ the accepting and rejecting states. Denote by $L(M)$ the language recognized by M . We can assume w.l.o.g. that there is a fixed symbol $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma_0$ such that all words accepted by M are of the form $\gamma_0 v$ with $v \in (\Gamma_0 \setminus \{\gamma_0\})^*$; in fact, it is easy to modify M to satisfy this property without changing the complexity of its word problem. We also assume that for any input $v \in \Gamma_0^*$, M uses exactly $|v|^{k_1}$ cells for the computation, halts after exactly $|v|^{k_2}$ steps in the accepting or rejecting state, and does not move to the left of the starting cell.

To represent inputs to M and to provide the space for simulating computations, we use grid ABoxes as in the proof of Theorem 37, where the tiling of the bottom row represents the input word followed by blank symbols. As the set of tile types, we use $\mathfrak{T} = \Gamma_0 \cup \{\beta, T, T_{\text{final}}\}$ where T is a ‘default tile’ that labels every position except those in the bottom row and the upper right corner. Identify T_{init} with γ_0 and let $\Sigma_g = \Gamma_0 \cup \{\beta, T, T_{\text{final}}\} \cup \{x, y, \hat{x}, \hat{y}\}$. Consider the TBox $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$ defined above, for $\mathfrak{P}_M = (\mathfrak{T}, H, V)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \{(\gamma_0, \gamma), (\gamma, \gamma'), (\gamma, \beta), (\beta, \beta), (T, T), (T, T_{\text{final}}) \mid \gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma_0 \setminus \{\gamma_0\}\} \\ V &= \{(\gamma, T), (\beta, T), (T, T), (T, T_{\text{final}}), (\gamma, T_{\text{final}}), (\beta, T_{\text{final}}) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$ checks whether a given Σ_g -ABox contains a grid structure with a tiling that respects H , V , T_{init} , and T_{final} , and derives the concept name A at the lower left corner of such grids. We now construct a TBox $\mathcal{T}_M$ that, after the verification has finished, initiates a computation of M on the grid. In addition to the concept names in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$, $\mathcal{T}_M$ uses concept names A_γ and $A_{q,\gamma}$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$ and $q \in Q$ to represent symbols written during the computation (in contrast to the elements of Γ_1 as concept names, used to encode the input word) and to represent the state and head position. In detail, $\mathcal{T}_M$ contains the following CIs:

- When the verification of the grid has finished, A floods the ABox:

$$A \sqsubseteq \forall r. A \quad \text{for all } r \in \{x, y, \hat{x}, \hat{y}\}.$$

- The initial configuration is as required:

$$\gamma_0 \sqcap A \sqsubseteq A_{q_0, \gamma_0} \quad \gamma \sqcap A \sqsubseteq A_\gamma \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in (\Gamma_0 \cup \{\beta\}) \setminus \{\gamma_0\}.$$

- For every $(q, \gamma) \in Q \times \Gamma_1$, the transition relation of M is satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{q, \gamma} \sqcap A &\sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{(q, \gamma, q', \gamma', L) \in \Delta} \exists y. (A_{\gamma'} \sqcap \bigsqcup_{\gamma'' \in \Gamma_1} \exists \hat{x}. A_{q', \gamma''}) \sqcup \\ &\bigsqcup_{(q, \gamma, q', \gamma', R) \in \Delta} \exists y. (A_{\gamma'} \sqcap \bigsqcup_{\gamma'' \in \Gamma_1} \exists x. A_{q', \gamma''}). \end{aligned}$$

- The symbol written on a cell does not change if the head is not on the cell:

$$A_\gamma \sqcap A \sqsubseteq \forall y. A_\gamma \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma_1$$

- The rejecting state is never reached:

$$A_{q_r, \gamma} \sqcap A \sqsubseteq \perp \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Gamma_1.$$

Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M} \cup \mathcal{T}_M$. We are going to show that an appropriate extended abstraction of $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies Conditions (1) and (2) of Theorem 38. We start with the following lemma which summarizes two important properties of $\mathcal{T}$.

Lemma 39.

- (1) $\mathcal{T}$ admits trivial models.
- (2) For any Σ_g -ABox $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ iff the following two conditions hold:
 - (a) $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$;
 - (b) let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}'$ be the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}$ given in Lemma 35 (2) and assume that $\mathcal{A}_i$ is the $n_i \times m_i$ -grid ABox with input v_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then the following hold for $1 \leq i \leq n$:
 - (i) $n_i \geq |v_i|^{k_1}$ and $m_i \geq |v_i|^{k_2}$ and
 - (ii) $v_i \in L(M)$.

Moreover, if $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, then it is strongly Σ_g -consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. Since (1) follows directly from the shape of the CIs in $\mathcal{T}$, we concentrate on (2). Assume first that $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$ and so we can assume that there is a decomposition $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}'$ of $\mathcal{A}$ as in Lemma 35 (2). By definition, each $\mathcal{A}_i$ is an $n_i \times m_i$ -grid ABox with input v_i . Since $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, there is a model $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{T}$. By the first CIs of $\mathcal{T}_M$ and since the initial node a of each $\mathcal{A}_i$ must be in $A^{\mathcal{I}}$ by Lemma 35, $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_i) \subseteq A^{\mathcal{I}}$ for each i . Thus the restriction of $\mathcal{I}$ to $\text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_i)$ simulates an accepting computation of M starting with v_i . But since every computation of M starting with a word of length n requires at least n^{k_1} space and m^{k_2} time and the containment of $\mathcal{A}_i$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is closed for the role names x and y , this is impossible if $n_i < |v_i|^{k_1}$ or $m_i < |v_i|^{k_2}$ and also if $v_i \notin L(M)$. Thus (i) and (ii) hold, as required.

For the converse direction, assume that (a) and (b) hold. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$, there is a decomposition $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n \cup \mathcal{A}'$ of $\mathcal{A}$ as in Lemma 35 (2). Also by Lemma 35 (2), there is a model $\mathcal{I}$ that witnesses strong Σ_g -consistency of $\mathcal{A}$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$ such that $a \in A^{\mathcal{I}}$ iff a is the initial node of some $\mathcal{A}_i$. We construct a model $\mathcal{I}'$ of $\mathcal{T}$ by modifying $\mathcal{I}$ as follows: with the exception of $\mathcal{A}$, the symbols of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$ are interpreted in the same way as in $\mathcal{I}$ and thus $\mathcal{I}'$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$. To satisfy the first CI of $\mathcal{T}_M$, we set $A^{\mathcal{I}'} = \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n)$. Note that this suffices since the containment of each $\mathcal{A}_i$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is closed for the role names x and y . The remaining symbols from $\mathcal{T}_M$ are now interpreted in such a way that they describe on each $\mathcal{A}_i$ an accepting computation for v_i . This is possible since $v_i \in L(M)$, $n_i \geq |v_i|^{k_1}$ and $m_i \geq |v_i|^{k_2}$, and each computation of M starting with a word v of length n requires at most n^{k_1} space and m^{k_2} time. It can be verified that $\mathcal{I}'$ is a model of $\mathcal{T}_M$; note that since $\mathcal{A}$ is a conjunct of the left hand side of every CI in $\mathcal{T}_M$, the CIs in $\mathcal{T}_M$ are trivially satisfied in every node $d \in \Delta^{\mathcal{I}'} \setminus \text{Ind}(\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_n)$. Thus $\mathcal{I}'$ satisfies $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ and we have proved consistency of $\mathcal{A}$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, as required.

For the ‘moreover’ part of the lemma, it suffices to observe that $\mathcal{I}'$ witnesses strong Σ_g -consistency of $\mathcal{A}$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. $\square$

We are now in the position to prove non-dichotomy.

Proof of Theorem 38. Let $L \in \text{CONP}$ and let M and $\mathcal{T}$ be the TM and TBox from above. Set $\Sigma = \text{sig}(\mathcal{T}) \setminus \Sigma_g$ and let $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$ be the enriched Σ -abstraction of $\mathcal{T}$. Thus, the only concept names that we are not ‘hiding’ are the concept names in Σ_g . We show that $\mathcal{T}$ satisfies Points (1) and (2) from Theorem 38.

- (1) It suffices to give a polynomial time reduction from $L(M)$ to the complement of evaluating $(\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \exists x M_0(x))$ (note that M_0 does not occur in any of the involved TBoxes). Assume that an input word v for M is given. If v is not from $\gamma_0(\Gamma_0 \setminus \{\gamma_0\})$, then reject. Otherwise, construct in polynomial time the $|v|^{k_1} \times |v|^{k_2}$ -grid ABox $\mathcal{A}$ with input v . Observe that $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_{\mathfrak{P}_M}$ and has the trivial decomposition $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1$ in Lemma 35 (2). Thus Lemma 39 (2) implies that $v \in L(M)$ iff $\mathcal{A}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. The latter condition is equivalent to $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \not\models \exists x M_0(x)$ since

M_0 does not occur in $\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{T}$. Since $\mathcal{T}$ admits trivial models, Lemma 30 (2) thus yields $v \in L(M)$ iff $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \not\models \exists x M_0(x)$.

(2) We first make the following observation.

Claim 1. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff

- $\mathcal{A}_{|\Sigma_g}$ is not consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ or
- $\mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$.

For the ‘only if’ direction, observe that if $\mathcal{A}_{|\Sigma_g}$ is consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, then Lemma 39 yields that $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly Σ_g -consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$. Thus, by Lemma 30 (4), $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ iff $\mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$. For the ‘if’ direction, observe that if $\mathcal{A}_{|\Sigma_g}$ is not consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$, then by Lemma 30 (1) $\mathcal{A}$ is not consistent w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}' \cup \mathcal{T}^\exists$. This finishes the proof of the claim.

By Lemma 30 (3), $\mathcal{T}^\exists, \mathcal{A} \models q(\vec{a})$ can be decided in polynomial time. Thus, Claim 1 implies that it suffices to give a polynomial time reduction of ABox consistency w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ to $L(M)$. But Lemma 39 (2) provides a polynomial reduction of ABox consistency w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}$ to $L(M)$ since

- Condition (a) of Lemma 39 (2) can be checked in polynomial time (by Lemma 35 (1));
- the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}$ in Condition (b) of Lemma 39 (2) as well as the words v_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, can be computed in polynomial time;
- and Point (i) of Condition (b) can be checked in polynomial time.

It thus remains to check whether $v_i \in L(M)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 38.

Theorems 38 and 19 imply that there is no PTIME/CONP-dichotomy, unless PTIME = NP.

Observe that the TBoxes constructed in the undecidability and the non-dichotomy proof are both of depth four. This can be easily reduced to depth three: recall that the TBoxes of depth four are obtained from TBoxes $\mathcal{T}$ of depth two by taking their enriched Σ -abstractions. One can obtain a TBox of depth three (for which query evaluation has the same complexity up to polynomial time reductions) by first replacing in $\mathcal{T}$ compound concepts C in the scope of a single value or existential restriction by fresh concept names A_C and adding $A_C \equiv C$ to $\mathcal{T}$. Then the fresh concept names are added to the signature Σ and one constructs the enriched abstraction of the resulting TBox for the extended signature. This TBox is as required. Thus, our undecidability and non-dichotomy results hold for $\mathcal{ALCF}$ TBoxes of depth three already.

8. DISCUSSION

We have studied the complexity of query evaluation in the presence of an ontology formulated in a DL between $\mathcal{ALC}$ and $\mathcal{ALCFI}$, focussing on the boundary between PTIME and CONP. For $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes of depth one (which covers the vast majority of practically relevant cases), our results are very positive: there is a dichotomy between PTIME and CONP and it can be precisely characterized in terms of unraveling tolerance and materializability. Moreover and unlike in the general case, PTIME complexity coincides with rewitability into Datalog[≠]. The case of higher or unrestricted depth is harder to analyze. We have shown that for $\mathcal{ALC}$ - and $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBoxes of depth three, the existence of a dichotomy between PTIME and CONP is equivalent to the Feder-Vardi conjecture that there is a dichotomy between PTIME and NP for CSPs with finite template—the case of depth two remains as an open problem. For $\mathcal{ALCF}$ TBoxes of depth three we have shown that there is no dichotomy unless PTIME = NP and that deciding whether a given TBox admits PTIME query evaluation is undecidable, and so are related questions.

Several interesting research questions remain. We briefly discuss three possible directions.

(1) Is it decidable whether a given $\mathcal{ALC}$ - or $\mathcal{ALCI}$ -TBox admits PTIME query evaluation and, closely related, whether it is unraveling tolerant and whether it is materializable? We conjecture that this is indeed the case for TBoxes of depth one, but we have no conjecture for TBoxes of larger depth. It is interesting to point out that unraveling tolerance is decidable for OMQs whose TBox is formulated in $\mathcal{ALCI}$ (where a concrete query is given, unlike in the case of unraveling tolerance of TBoxes); in that case, unraveling tolerance is equivalent to rewritability into monadic Datalog [FKL]. It would also be interesting to study more general notions of unraveling tolerance based on unravelings into structures of bounded treewidth rather than into real trees.

(2) It would be interesting to study additional complexity classes such as LOGSPACE, NLOGSPACE, and AC^0 . It is known that all these classes occur even for $\mathcal{ALC}$ TBoxes of depth one, see e.g. [CDL⁺13]. For example, CQ-evaluation w.r.t. the depth one $\mathcal{EL}$ -TBox $\{\exists r.A \sqsubseteq A\}$, which encodes reachability in directed graphs, is NLOGSPACE-complete. It would thus be interesting to identify further dichotomies such as between NLOGSPACE and PTIME. We conjecture that for $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes of depth one, it is decidable whether query evaluation is in PTIME, NLOGSPACE, LOGSPACE, and AC^0 .

(3) Apart from deciding whether query evaluation w.r.t. a given TBox has a certain complexity, it is also interesting to decide whether the TBox admits rewritability into relevant query languages such as FO-queries or Datalog queries. In the context of OMQs, several results have been obtained, see e.g. [BLW13, HLSW15, BHLW16] for FO-rewritability of OMQs whose TBox is formulated in a Horn DL and [BtCLW14, FKL] for FO- and Datalog-rewritability of OMQs whose TBox is formulated in $\mathcal{ALC}$ or an extension thereof. In the TBox (rather than OMQ) case, a first relevant result has been established in [LW11] where it is shown that that FO-rewritability is decidable for materializable $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes of depth one. This underlines the importance of deciding materializability, which would allow to lift this result to (otherwise unrestricted) $\mathcal{ALCFI}$ -TBoxes of depth one.

Acknowledgments. Carsten Lutz was supported by ERC consolidator grant 647289. Frank Wolter was supported by EPSRC grant EP/M012646/1.

REFERENCES

- [ABI⁺05] Eric Allender, Michael Bauland, Neil Immerman, Henning Schnoor, and Heribert Vollmer. The complexity of satisfiability problems: Refining Schaefer’s theorem. In *MFCS*, pages 71–82, 2005.
- [ACKZ09] Alessandro Artale, Diego Calvanese, Roman Kontchakov, and Michael Zakharyashev. The DL-Lite family and relations. *J. Artif. Intell. Res. (JAIR)*, 36:1–69, 2009.
- [ACY91] Foto N. Afrati, Stavros S. Cosmadakis, and Mihalis Yannakakis. On datalog vs. polynomial time. In *PODS*, pages 13–25, 1991.
- [Bar14] Libor Barto. Constraint satisfaction problem and universal algebra. *SIGLOG News*, 1(2):14–24, 2014.
- [BBL05] Franz Baader, Sebastian Brandt, and Carsten Lutz. Pushing the $\mathcal{EL}$ envelope. In *IJCAI*, pages 364–369. Professional Book Center, 2005.
- [BBLW16] Franz Baader, Meghyn Bienvenu, Carsten Lutz, and Frank Wolter. Query and predicate emptiness in ontology-based data access. *J. Artif. Intell. Res. (JAIR)*, 56:1–59, 2016.
- [BGO10] Vince Barany, Georg Gottlob, and Martin Otto. Querying the guarded fragment. In *LICS*, pages 1–10, 2010.
- [BHLW16] Meghyn Bienvenu, Peter Hansen, Carsten Lutz, and Frank Wolter. First order-rewritability and containment of conjunctive queries in Horn description logics. In *IJCAI*, pages 965–971, 2016.
- [BJK05] Andrei A. Bulatov, Peter Jeavons, and Andrei A. Krokhin. Classifying the complexity of constraints using finite algebras. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 34(3):720–742, 2005.
- [BLW13] Meghyn Bienvenu, Carsten Lutz, and Frank Wolter. First-order rewritability of atomic queries in horn description logics. In *IJCAI*, pages 754–760, 2013.

- [BMRT11] Jean-Francois Baget, Marie-Laure Mugnier, Sebastian Rudolph, and Michael Thomazo. Walking the complexity lines for generalized guarded existential rules. In *IJCAI*, pages 712–717, 2011.
- [BO15] Meghyn Bienvenu and Magdalena Ortiz. Ontology-mediated query answering with data-tractable description logics. In *Reasoning Web*, volume 9203 of *LNCS*, pages 218–307. Springer, 2015.
- [BtCLW14] Meghyn Bienvenu, Balder ten Cate, Carsten Lutz, and Frank Wolter. Ontology-based data access: A study through disjunctive datalog, CSP, and MMSNP. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 39(4):33:1–33:44, 2014.
- [Bul02] Andrei A. Bulatov. A dichotomy theorem for constraints on a three-element set. In *FOCS*, pages 649–658, 2002.
- [Bul11] Andrei A. Bulatov. On the CSP dichotomy conjecture. In *CSR*, pages 331–344, 2011.
- [CDGL⁺07] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Domenico Lembo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Riccardo Rosati. Tractable reasoning and efficient query answering in description logics: The *DL-Lite* family. *J. of Autom. Reasoning*, 39(3):385–429, 2007.
- [CDL⁺13] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Domenico Lembo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Riccardo Rosati. Data complexity of query answering in description logics. *Artificial Intelligence*, 195:335–360, 2013.
- [CGK13] Andrea Calì, Georg Gottlob, and Michael Kifer. Taming the infinite chase: Query answering under expressive relational constraints. *J. Artif. Intell. Res. (JAIR)*, 48:115–174, 2013.
- [CGLV00] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Moshe Y. Vardi. View-based query processing and constraint satisfaction. In *LICS*, pages 361–371, 2000.
- [CGLV03a] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Moshe Y. Vardi. Reasoning on regular path queries. *SIGMOD Record*, 32(4):83–92, 2003.
- [CGLV03b] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Moshe Y. Vardi. View-based query containment. In *PODS*, pages 56–67, 2003.
- [CGT89] Stefano Ceri, Georg Gottlob, and Letizia Tanca. What you always wanted to know about datalog (and never dared to ask). *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 1(1):146–166, 1989.
- [CK90] C. C. Chang and H. Jerome Keisler. *Model Theory*, volume 73 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Elsevier, 1990.
- [EGOS08] Thomas Eiter, Georg Gottlob, Magdalena Ortiz, and Mantas Simkus. Query answering in the description logic Horn-*SHIQ*. In *JELIA*, pages 166–179, 2008.
- [FKL] Cristina Feier, Antti Kuusisto, and Carsten Lutz. Rewritability in monadic disjunctive datalog, MMSNP, and expressive description logics. To appear.
- [FKMP05] Ronald Fagin, Phokion G. Kolaitis, Renée J. Miller, and Lucian Popa. Data exchange: semantics and query answering. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 336(1):89–124, 2005.
- [FV93] Tomás Feder and Moshe Y. Vardi. Monotone monadic SNP and constraint satisfaction. In *STOC*, pages 612–622, 1993.
- [GLHS08] Birte Glimm, Carsten Lutz, Ian Horrocks, and Ulrike Sattler. Conjunctive query answering for the description logic *SHIQ*. *JAIR*, 31:157–204, 2008.
- [GO07] Valentin Goranko and Martin Otto. Model theory of modal logic. In *Handbook of Modal Logic*, pages 249–329. Elsevier, 2007.
- [HLSW15] Peter Hansen, Carsten Lutz, Inanç Seylan, and Frank Wolter. Efficient query rewriting in the description logic $\mathcal{EL}$ and beyond. In *IJCAI*, pages 3034–3040, 2015.
- [HMS07] Ullrich Hustadt, Boris Motik, and Ulrike Sattler. Reasoning in description logics by a reduction to disjunctive datalog. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 39(3):351–384, 2007.
- [HN90] Pavol Hell and Jaroslav Nesetril. On the complexity of *h*-coloring. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 48(1):92–110, 1990.
- [Kaz09] Yevgeny Kazakov. Consequence-driven reasoning for Horn-*SHIQ* ontologies. In Craig Boutilier, editor, *IJCAI*, pages 2040–2045, 2009.
- [KL07] Adila Krisnadhi and Carsten Lutz. Data complexity in the $\mathcal{EL}$ family of description logics. In *LPAR*, pages 333–347, 2007.
- [KLT⁺10] Roman Kontchakov, Carsten Lutz, David Toman, Frank Wolter, and Michael Zakharyashev. The combined approach to query answering in DL-Lite. In *KR*, 2010.
- [KRH07] Markus Krötzsch, Sebastian Rudolph, and Pascal Hitzler. Complexity boundaries for Horn description logics. In *AAAI*, pages 452–457, 2007.
- [Kro10a] Andrei A. Krokhin. Tree dualities for constraint satisfaction. In *CSL*, pages 32–33, 2010.
- [Krö10b] Markus Krötzsch. Efficient inferencing for OWL EL. In *JELIA*, pages 234–246, 2010.

- [KS09] Gábor Kun and Mario Szegedy. A new line of attack on the dichotomy conjecture. In *STOC*, pages 725–734, 2009.
- [KZ14] Roman Kontchakov and Michael Zakharyashev. An introduction to description logics and query rewriting. In *Reasoning Web*, volume 8714 of *LNCS*, pages 195–244. Springer, 2014.
- [LLT07] Benoit Larose, Cynthia Loten, and Claude Tardif. A characterisation of first-order constraint satisfaction problems. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3(4), 2007.
- [LPW11] Carsten Lutz, Robert Piro, and Frank Wolter. Description logic tboxes: Model-theoretic characterizations and rewritability. In *IJCAI*, 2011.
- [LSW13] Carsten Lutz, Inanç Seylan, and Frank Wolter. Ontology-based data access with closed predicates is inherently intractable (sometimes). In *IJCAI*, pages 1024–1030. IJCAI/AAAI, 2013.
- [LSW15] Carsten Lutz, Inanç Seylan, and Frank Wolter. Ontology-mediated queries with closed predicates. In *IJCAI*, pages 3120–3126. AAAI Press, 2015.
- [LTW09] Carsten Lutz, David Toman, and Frank Wolter. Conjunctive query answering in the description logic $\mathcal{EL}$ using a relational database system. In *IJCAI*, pages 2070–2075, 2009.
- [LW10] Carsten Lutz and Frank Wolter. Deciding inseparability and conservative extensions in the description logic $\mathcal{EL}$. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 45(2):194–228, 2010.
- [LW11] Carsten Lutz and Frank Wolter. Non-uniform data complexity of query answering in description logics. In *Description Logics*, 2011.
- [LW12] Carsten Lutz and Frank Wolter. Non-uniform data complexity of query answering in description logics. In *KR*. AAAI Press, 2012.
- [Mak87] Johann A. Makowsky. Why Horn formulas matter in computer science: Initial structures and generic examples. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 34(2/3):266–292, 1987.
- [Mal71] Anatoli I. Malcev. *The metamathematics of algebraic systems, collected papers:1936-1967*. North-Holland, 1971.
- [MG85] Jose Meseguer and Joseph A. Goguen. Initiality, induction, and computability. In *Algebraic Methods in Semantics*, pages 459–541. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [OCE08] Magdalena Ortiz, Diego Calvanese, and Thomas Eiter. Data complexity of query answering in expressive description logics via tableaux. *J. of Autom. Reasoning*, 41(1):61–98, 2008.
- [PLC⁺08] Antonella Poggi, Domenico Lembo, Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Riccardo Rosati. Linking data to ontologies. *J. Data Semantics*, 10:133–173, 2008.
- [Ros07] Riccardo Rosati. The limits of querying ontologies. In *ICDT*, volume 4353 of *LNCS*, pages 164–178. Springer, 2007.
- [Sch78] Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *STOC*, pages 216–226, 1978.
- [Sch93] Andrea Schaerf. On the complexity of the instance checking problem in concept languages with existential quantification. *J. of Intel. Inf. Systems*, 2:265–278, 1993.